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ABSTRACT

(Under the direction of Shimul Melwani)

In this dissertation, I explore the influence of mega-threats – large scale, negative, identity relevant occurrences that receive significant media attention – on individuals at work. Mega-threats are frequent occurrences in our society today, yet the influence of these events on individuals remains unclear. I explicate the psychological consequences of these events – namely anticipatory threat – for event observers that share identity group membership with individual(s) that are attacked, threatened, or harmed in these events. I further propose that this experience of threat spills over into the workplace, but in general organizational norms dictate its suppression, leading individuals to engage in a process of emotional and cognitive suppression that I characterize as identity labor. I then argue that identity labor leads to lower levels of task and social engagement, but that close work relationships are an important buffer to this effect. Employing a variety of methodologies, I empirically examine this theoretical model across four studies with diverse samples. Across two experimental studies, I investigated the interactive effect of mega-threats and shared group membership on experiences of anticipatory threat and identity labor. In Study 1, I found that women experienced higher levels of anticipatory threat after reading about a mega-threat involving a female victim. In Study 2, I found that Black employees experienced higher levels of anticipatory threat after reading about a mega-threat involving a Black
victim, and that they anticipated that this threat would lead them to engage in higher levels of identity labor at work. In Study 3, I conducted an online field study in the aftermath of a mega-threat, and in Study 4 I conducted a longitudinal study that examined the effects of several mega-threats on individuals at work. Results from both studies suggest that in the aftermath of a mega-threat, individuals that share identity group membership with victims of the event experience higher levels of anticipatory threat that spills over into the workplace leading to higher levels of identity labor and lower levels of task and social engagement. Taken together this work yields important theoretical and practical implications about the significant influence that societal events have on employees at work.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Societal events have the potential to shake the foundations of communities, structures, and organizations. For example, the 2012 shooting of Black teenager Trayvon Martin by a White neighborhood watch volunteer captured the attention of millions of Americans and sparked the creation of the Black Lives Matter social movement. In another instance, a highly publicized exposé detailing numerous sexual assault allegations against Hollywood producer Harvey Weinstein in October 2017 inspired 1.7 million tweets and reignited the MeToo social movement. Indeed, research suggests that these major societal occurrences not only influence societal structures, but could also have effects at every level within organizations, “from the most molar environmental level to the most molecular individual level” (Morgeson et al., 2015, p. 515). However, while scholars have examined the influence of large scale societal events on firm-level behavior (Tilcsik & Marquis, 2013), little research has explored how these events impinge on employees within organizations.

Recognizing the importance of major societal occurrences, Leigh and Melwani (2019) introduced a theory of mega-threats – large scale identity relevant negative occurrences that receive significant media attention – that begins to explain the impact of these types of major societal occurrences on organizations. Their theory focused on a particular type of mega-threat, the recent spate of highly publicized instances of police brutality enacted against Black Americans. With this mega-threat in the foreground, the authors proposed that instances of police brutality enacted against Black Americans elicit visceral reactions from other Black Americans because of their shared racial identity with
victims of the event. Their dual-pathway model suggests that mega-threats can act as a catalyst that motivates social identity group members to engage in positive behaviors on behalf of their group in organizations. However, this theory highlights that these risky positive progroup behaviors may only occur when there are organizational structures in place that lead employees to feel empowered to engage in behaviors that depart from organizational norms. Thus, while positive organizational change is one possible outcome of mega-threats, it is imperative that organizational scholars continue to investigate the consequences of mega-threats in organizations.

Therefore, the purpose of this dissertation is to extend current theorizing about mega-threats by developing a theoretical framework that clarifies the psychological processes triggered by mega-threats and explains the consequences of these events for employees at work. Toward this end, I build a theoretical model (see Figure 1 for full model) and provide empirical evidence designed to answer three research questions.

First, what are the psychological evaluations that observers make when interpreting the causes of mega-threats, and what are their proximal outcomes? To answer this question, I propose that negative societal events are identity related, and consequently can be considered a mega-threat, when event observers make attributions (Jones & Davis, 1965; Jones & Nisbett, 1971), that the victim(s) of the event was targeted and/or harmed because they are members of a of a particular social group. Furthermore, I propose that these attributions to social group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1985), or identity attributions (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002), lead to a heightened awareness of the pervasive risk of discrimination or physical harm that often accompanies identity group membership. I propose that this heightened awareness of discrimination has a unique influence on event observers that are members of
the harmed identity group – leading group members to experience anticipatory threat, or to become concerned that a similar negative event may personally happen to them.

I then seek to understand how individuals manage this threat at work. In answering this second question, I suggest that the typically taboo nature of discussing social identities in the workplace forces employees to engage in an effortful process of suppressing their threat related cognitions and emotions that I refer to as identity labor. I propose that identity labor is a combined process of identity concealment (Petriglieri, 2011) and emotional labor (Grandey, 2000) that occurs as a result of organizational norms that dictate the suppression of identity threat in the workplace. Furthermore, I posit that identity labor consumes psychological resources that, in turn, prevents individuals from fully engaging with work tasks and socially with their work colleagues (Christian et al., 2011; Kahn, 1990; Melwani & Sharma, 2018).

Third, and finally, I investigate the research question how can employees’ buffer themselves against the negative influence of mega-threats? I propose that close work relationships, defined as relationships where individuals feel a sense of connection to their work colleagues that goes beyond tasks associated with their work (Bacharach et al., 2005; Dumas et al., 2013), provide individuals with a buffer against the negative consequences of mega-threats. Close work relationships typically involve integration experiences where individuals infuse aspects of their personal and cultural heritage into their work relationships (Dumas et al., 2013; Dutton et al., 2010). By enabling the sharing of authentic cognitions and emotions, close work relationships reduce the need for cognitive and emotional suppression. Thus, I argue that close work relationships attenuate the effect of anticipatory threat on identity labor.
This dissertation makes three important contributions to our understanding of the influence of mega-threats on individuals in organizations. First, by explicating the psychological evaluations and consequences of mega-threats this paper extends current research on mega-threats. In their original conception of mega-threats Leigh and Melwani (2019) posited that societal events can be considered mega-threats when they are negative, large-scale, and identity relevant. However, the authors did not explicitly consider how observers of societal events infer that an individual or group was harmed because of their social identity, thus making the event identity relevant. This paper extends this work by demonstrating that negative societal events can be deemed identity relevant, and therefore are mega-threats, when observers make the attribution that the victim(s) of the event were targeted and/or harmed because they are a member of a specific identity group.

Second, by developing the construct of identity labor this paper addresses calls for research that jointly examines cognitive and emotional authenticity in organizations (Cha et al., 2019). In a recent review of the literature on authenticity in organizations Cha and colleagues (2019) noted that emotional labor and identity concealment can be viewed as forms of inauthenticity in organizations, yet research on these constructs has largely developed separately. In contrast, my theory proposes that identity labor is a dynamic process of cognitive and emotional suppression that occurs as a result of the tension between experiencing identity-based threat and knowing that expressing this threat goes against organizational norms that dictate appropriate self-expression.

Third, by explicating the downstream behavioral consequences of mega-threats in organizations this dissertation advances our understanding of the impact that changes in societal context can have on behaviors at work. I posit that mega-threats are important
occurrences for organizations because these events lead individuals to engage in identity labor that then reduces both task and social engagement in the workplace. This work advances research on work engagement by demonstrating the important influence that events which occur outside the bounds of organizations can have on behaviors that are enacted within the bounds of organizations.

In sum, this dissertation provides a comprehensive theory that explicates the psychological experience of mega-threats and seeks to provide empirical evidence of the individual level consequences of mega-threats on employees at work. In the next section of this paper, I will integrate disparate literatures on events, attributions to discrimination, and inter-group threat to explicate the psychological consequences of mega-threats. Then, drawing from theories on identity management, authenticity, and work engagement I build a theoretical model that explains the negative downstream consequences of mega-threats on impacted identity group members at work. I also identify one moderating factor that may reduce these negative consequences. Next, I report the methods and results of a laboratory study that tests the influence of mega-threats on individuals that are members vs. non-members of a harmed identity group (Study 1). Then, I report the methods and results of an online experimental study where I replicate the findings from my laboratory study with a different identity group under study, and I begin to develop my measure of identity labor (Study 2). Following the initial development of my measure of identity labor, I report the methods and results of an online field study where I further validate my measure of identity labor and test the total effect of mega-threats on task and social engagement after the occurrence of a mega-threat (Study 3). Finally, I report the methods and results of a longitudinal study where I test my full theoretical model and I examine the causal effects in
my model with two different samples (Study 4). I conclude by elucidating the theoretical contributions of my work, and I highlight the practical implications, future directions, and limitations of this research.
CHAPTER 2: DEFINING MEGA-THREATS

There is a long tradition in organizational research of investigating organizational phenomena by examining the influence of events that are encountered by organizations or the entities within them (Allport, 1940; Pepper, 1948). Organizational research on the effects of events defined as discrete, discontinuous, non-routine episodes that occur within and outside of an organization’s environment (Morgeson et al., 2015) has historically focused on events that directly or personally involve organizations and/or the individuals within them. For instance, affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) and research on traumatic work-related events (Bacharach & Bamberger, 2007) demonstrates that events that employees encounter within the workplace can lead to important changes in employee’s emotions, behaviors, and well-being. Research on life events demonstrates that personal events, such as divorce or death of a loved one, have an important influence on organizational outcomes such as job stress and work performance (Bhagat, 1983; Bhagat et al., 1985; Haynie & Shepherd, 2011). While this wide-ranging work provides a thorough picture of the influence of personal events on work outcomes, it has not considered the potential influence of events that do not personally happen to individuals (Mark & Mellor, 1991) on work outcomes. Yet by virtue of living in a connected world where individuals are inundated by news about societal occurrences that happen all over the world, individuals actually encounter, and therefore may be influenced by societal events, even when these occurrences happen to distant others (Leigh & Melwani, 2019; Leonardi & Vaast, 2017).
Recognizing the importance of societal events Leigh and Melwani (2019) introduced a theory of *mega-threats* – large scale negative identity related episodes that receive significant media attention – that begins to consider the influence of societal events on individuals at work. In this work the authors proposed that mega-threats have three defining features. First, mega-threats are overwhelmingly negative occurrences that consist of individuals or groups of individuals being attacked, threatened, or physically harmed. Second, mega-threats are large-scale events that garner significant attention through both traditional media outlets and on social media platforms. Third, these occurrences are identity related because they highlight the devaluation of a particular identity group in society, making them important occurrences for any individual that is a member of this identity group.

Examples of mega-threats that have occurred recently in society abound: the shooting of Stephon Clark, an unarmed Black man, by two police officers in Sacramento, CA, the separation of immigrant families at the U.S./Mexico border, The Tree of Life Jewish Synagogue shooting in Pittsburgh, PA, and Dr. Christine Blasey Ford’s highly publicized senate hearing testimony that was an account of sexual assault she contends was committed by then Supreme court nominee Judge Brett Kavanaugh during high school. Leigh and Melwani (2019) posited that mega-threats are important occurrences for minority employees that may galvanize them to engage in risky pro-group behavior that benefits their group and their organization. While this work begins to shed light on the influence of mega-threats on individuals, the demarcation between mega-threats and other types of societal events still remains unclear.
As described by Leigh and Melwani (2019), the defining feature that separates mega-threats from other large-scale events is the fact that these occurrences are identity related. However, in their original conception of mega-threats the authors did not explain how observers come to infer that a large-scale societal occurrence is related to social identity. Utilizing an attribution theory lens (Jones & Davis, 1965) I posit that in order for an event to be deemed identity related individuals must attribute, or infer that the event was caused by (Jones & Davis, 1965), or occurred because the victim(s) of the event are members of a particular identity group. In the section below, I explicate the two identity related attributions that I propose observers must make in order for a negative large-scale event to be appraised as identity related, and as a consequence be considered a mega-threat.

In general, attribution theories explain how individuals make attributions, or judgements about the causes of an event (Jones & Davis, 1965; Jones & Nisbett, 1971). Attributions about the causes of an event are typically described as either external – arising from situational or contextual factors – or internal – arising from stable dispositional characteristics (Jones & Nisbett, 1971). Extending this work to situations of discrimination or prejudice, Major and colleagues (2002) assert that attributions to discrimination involve two judgements that involve both internal and external attributions. First, attributions to discrimination involve an internal attribution that negative treatment or harm occurred because an individual possesses an attribute or characteristic that is devalued in a particular social context or in society. Second, attributions to discrimination involve an external attribution that the actor, or person inflicting the mistreatment or harm, holds an inherent bias or prejudice against individuals that possess the relevant attribute or characteristic. Furthermore, this work suggests that one of the most important antecedents to attributions to
discrimination is the possession of stigma, or belonging to a social identity group that is
devalued within society (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002), as this increases the possibility that
individuals will be the target of discrimination (Crocker et al., 1993; Crocker & Major, 1989;
Major, Gramzow, et al., 2002; Major, Quinton, et al., 2002). While this research explains
how individuals make attributions to discrimination for personal experiences, it has not
considered whether individuals make similar attributions for events that they are not directly
involved in.

Drawing from Major and colleagues (2002) work, I argue that in the wake of a
negative large-scale event observers may make similar identity attributions to those related to
personal experiences of discrimination. Furthermore, I posit that when event observers make
two identity related attributions, or inferences that victim(s) of a societal event were targeted
or harmed because they are members of a particular identity group, it leads event observers to
conclude that the event is identity related, and thus the societal event can be considered a
mega-threat. First, I propose that when consuming news about a large-scale event observers
may infer or make the internal attribution that the victim in the event was harmed because
they belong to a particular devalued or stigmatized social identity group. Second, observers
of societal events may also make the external attribution that the actor, or person inflicting
the harm, holds an inherent bias or prejudice against all individuals who belong to the
victim’s identity group. While these attributions are similar to those made by individuals
when they personally experience discrimination (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002), the scale or
significant media attention garnered by mega-threats makes these instances unique because
multitudes of individuals are exposed to and may collectively make the same identity
attributions about the causes of the event. In addition, the consequences of the identity
attributions that encompass mega-threats are also unique because, as I describe in the next chapter, these attributions have differing consequences for observers depending on their own identity group membership.
CHAPTER 3: MODEL OF THE IMPACT OF MEGA-THREATS ON EMPLOYEES

To understand the impact of mega-threats on individuals at work I propose a theoretical model that explains the multi-step process whereby mega-threats lead to cognitive, emotional, and behavioral changes in the workplace. In Step 1, I argue that the consequences of mega-threats differ based on identity group membership, such that mega-threats lead to a heightened awareness of the increased risk of harm that may befall any member of a particular identity group, leading individuals that belong to this identity group to experience feelings of anticipatory threat. Then in Step 2, I posit that when individuals enter the workplace they continue to cope with this experience of threat, but the typically taboo nature of discussing social identities in the workplace prevents employees from expressing this threat. As a consequence of this interaction between experiencing identity-based threat and organizational norms that constrain the expression of this threat, I argue that individuals engage in an effortful process of cognitive and emotional suppression that I refer to as identity labor. Finally, in Step 3, I propose that because identity labor is an effortful process that consumes psychological resources it leads to reduced task and social engagement in the workplace. In the sections below, I describe the psychological consequences of mega-threats and explain how the psychological consequences of mega-threats spills over into organizations leading to changes in behaviors at work.

Step 1: The Psychological Consequences of Mega-Threats

In the wake of a mega-threat any observer, regardless of their identity group membership, may make the identity attributions described in the previous chapter. However,
I posit that the psychological consequences of the identity attributions that encompass mega-threats differ based on event observers own identities. In the section below, I argue that because mega-threats highlight the potential for identity-based discrimination or harm that could potentially befall any member of the harmed identity group, these societal events lead event observers that are also members of the harmed identity group to experience anticipatory threat.

Individuals generally believe that we live in a predictable world, and that they are impervious to negative events (Janoff-Bulman, 1992). Threats, or negative events that highlight the potential for loss (Chattopadhyay et al., 2001), are particularly challenging for individuals to cope with because they shatter these positive assumptions about the world (Janoff-Bulman, 1992). When individuals encounter threats it typically triggers a threat response, or leads individuals to enter a state of readiness in which they assess the nature of the threat and their ability to cope with the threat (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Furthermore, threats frequently lead individuals to become hyper-vigilant to their environment, where they begin to anticipate and protect against future losses (Kouchaki & Desai, 2015; Stephan et al., 2015). Scholars have argued that personal experiences of discrimination are typically appraised as threats because social identity is a central component of the self, and thus threats to one’s identity are experienced as threats to the self (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002; McCoy & Major, 2003). Given that mega-threats involve the perception that a negative event occurred because of an individual’s (or group’s) social identity, I argue that these events make salient the pervasive risk of discrimination, and in some cases physical harm, that often accompanies membership within certain identity groups (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002). This heightened awareness of devaluation of an identity, or stigma (Crocker et al., 1991; Crocker
& Major, 1989), may not be important for event observers who do not share this identity, because these individuals do not possess the devalued characteristic; and as a result these events do not represent a threat to their self-concept. However, when an event observer is a member of the targeted and/or harmed identity group it likely leads to the perception that the observer could also personally suffer a similarly negative outcome because they possess the devalued characteristic that caused the negative event. Thus, I argue that mega-threats have important personal consequences for any observer who shares social identities with victim(s) of the event because these occurrences can be appraised as personal threats that have the potential to trigger a threat response in which identity group members anticipate that they may become victims of a similarly negative discriminatory event.

The relationship between the experience of personal discrimination and experiences of threat is well established. For example, McCoy and Major (2003) found that when women participants were confronted with negative feedback from a sexist evaluator they experienced significantly higher levels of threat than those that received negative feedback from a non-sexist evaluator. In another study, Townsend and colleagues (2011) found that when women were rejected from a position for overtly sexist reasons, such as being too emotional, they experienced significantly higher levels of threat than those that were rejected based on merit (Townsend et al., 2011). In a third paper, Dover and colleagues (2015) found that Hispanic participants were more likely to make attributions to discrimination and experience threat as a result of unfair treatment from an outgroup member than an ingroup member (Dover et al., 2015).

Drawing on this body of work, I argue that when individuals encounter mega-threats and they are members of the targeted and/or harmed identity group, these events trigger an
anticipatory threat response. More specifically, I argue that mega-threats act as a shock that leads identity group members to enter a state of readiness in which individuals perceive that they, or other members of their group, are at greater risk for personally experiencing a negative event – leading individuals to experience anticipatory threat. Anticipatory threat is an adverse cognitive and emotional response to being threatened where individuals anticipate that they are at greater risk for personally experiencing a negative loss situation (Janoff-Bulman & Frieze, 1983; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). I propose that anticipatory threat triggered in response to a mega-threat is a negative high arousal experience where individuals become hyper-vigilant to the potential that they could personally experience identity-based discrimination or physical harm. As an example, in the case of the shooting of Trayvon Martin, many observers made the attribution that Trayvon was killed because he was a young Black male; and that his shooter held an inherent bias that Black males are suspicious and threatening. In turn, this led many Black Americans, from singer/songwriter, Sean “Puff Daddy” Combs and then U.S. President Barack Obama to publicly express fear that they or their families could become a target of similarly racially motivated violence (Fowler, 2012; Tau, 2012). In this example, the mega-threat, or the shooting death of Trayvon Martin, triggered other Black Americans to experience anticipatory threat where they became concerned that they too could become victims of a negative discriminatory event. Based on these arguments I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): The effect of mega-threats on experiences of anticipatory threat is higher for event observers that are members of the harmed identity group than for those that are not.
Step 2: The Mediating Role of Identity Labor

The experience of anticipatory threat that arises in response to mega-threats does not dissipate when individuals who belong to the harmed identity group enter the workplace. Instead, this threat likely spills over into workplace experiences, influencing impacted identity group member’s emotions, cognitions, and behaviors at work (Leigh & Melwani, 2019). Given the typically taboo nature of discussing social identities, particularly those associated with minority group status, in the workplace (Ragins, 1997; Roberts, 2005), I propose that these events may be particularly challenging to cope with at work.

In the next section of this paper, I argue that as a consequence of the interaction between experiencing arousing threat-related cognitions and emotions that stay at the forefront of our minds and organizational norms that prevent individuals from sharing authentic thoughts and emotions related to their social identities, individuals will likely engage in a process that I call identity labor. In the sections below, I define identity labor and describe it as the mechanism that links anticipatory threat experienced as a result of a mega-threat to behavioral changes in the workplace.

Building the Definition of Identity Labor. In diverse organizations, organizational members typically engage in identity management strategies to effectively navigate and manage their interactions with individuals from different cultural backgrounds (Roberts, 2005). One prominent identity management strategy is to conceal or downplay social identities at work (Petriglieri, 2011; Roberts, 2005). In many organizations, individuals that are members of minority identity groups routinely engage in identity suppression because there are aspects of their social identities that do not align with traditional organizational norms or a professional image (Ragins, 1997; Roberts, 2005). Indeed, there are numerous
examples of individuals switching off or downplaying their social identities at work: female scientists describe hiding their female identities when enacting a scientist identity (Settles, 2004); mothers “put on their work hats” when they enter the workplace (Ladge et al., 2012); Black female employees describe needing to “lose their Blackness” and “act White” at work (Bell & Nkomo, 2001, p. 13); and homosexual men have described preferring to keep “personal matters out of the office” (Woods & Lucas, 1993). However, even as some minority organizational members may decide to switch off their identities at work, others may pursue a more integrative identity management strategy where they infuse aspects of their social identities into their professional image (Roberts, 2005). For example, female professionals in male-dominated industries may include both masculine and feminine characteristics into their professional identities (Ely, 1995), and Black female professionals may display aspects of their cultural heritage in the workplace, like wearing an African pin or wearing their hair in a natural style (Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Rosette & Dumas, 2007).

Whether an individual typically decides to switch off their minority identity at work or finds ways to integrate it into their professional identity, mega-threats will likely interrupt these routine identity management processes. More specifically, I argue that the shock of a mega-threat leads social identities to remain salient in the workplace (Leigh & Melwani, 2019), and this salience coupled with the arousing experience of anticipatory threat (Branscombe & Wann, 1994) makes it particularly difficult for individuals to suppress their negative reactions to the event. Yet, because the mega-threat is identity relevant, and thus perceived and experienced differently depending on identity group membership, individuals may perceive that revealing their negative event reactions will lead to negative organizational consequences, such as highlighting dissimilarity from their coworkers (Dumas et al., 2013;
As a consequence of the tension between experiencing arousing negative threat related cognitions and emotions and knowing that expressing these cognitions and emotions goes against organizational norms that dictate appropriate self-expressions in the workplace (Cha et al., 2019), I propose that mega-threats lead affected identity group members to engage in a psychological process I refer to as identity labor. I define identity labor as the effort, planning, and control needed to suppress cognitions and emotions that arise from experiences of identity related threat within the workplace. In other words, I posit that identity labor is an arduous process of identity concealment (Petriglieri, 2011) and emotional labor (Grandey, 2000) that occurs within the workplace as a result of an experience of threat.

**Components of Identity Labor.** There are three key components to this definition of identity labor that warrant further explanation. First, at the core of this definition is that identity labor occurs as a result of an experience of identity based threat. As described in the prior sections, mega-threats lead affected identity group members to experience anticipatory threat. If this experience of threat was related to a societal event that impacted everyone in an organization uniformly, such as a hurricane that causes extensive damage within a community (Stephan et al., 2015), then all individuals, including minorities, may feel comfortable openly discussing the threat they experienced as a result of the event. However, I propose that because anticipatory threat experienced as a result of a mega-threat is fundamentally linked to identity group membership individuals may feel the need to suppress this experience of threat in the workplace.
Second, I posit that identity labor occurs within social interactions or organizational contexts that limit the expression of social identities. As discussed above, under normal circumstances, employees may engage in multiple strategies to manage their identities in the workplace. However, regardless of the identity management strategy that individuals typically pursue I argue that the experience of threat related to identity group membership interrupts these identity management strategies. When individuals experience identity threat they typically become consumed by negative cognitions and emotions about their identity (Inzlicht & Kang, 2010), and they feel compelled to share these negative thoughts and feelings with others (Leigh & Melwani, 2019). Yet, individuals may perceive that discussing this experience of threat with coworkers, particularly those who do not share the harmed identity, may have negative consequences for them in organizations (Dumas et al., 2013). Thus, I posit that instead of openly displaying or discussing their authentic threat related cognitions and emotions in the workplace identity group members likely decide to engage in a psychological process to actively suppress these adverse threat reactions.

Third, identity labor involves concealing or suppressing identity related cognitions and emotions. While research examining identity suppression and emotional suppression has largely developed separately (Cha et al., 2019), theories of stress and coping posit that the experience of threat and the resulting suppression of this threat has both affective and cognitive components (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Building on this work, I argue that identity labor is a combined process of cognitive and emotional suppression.

From a cognitive perspective, identity concealment, or the effortful suppression of thoughts associated with an identity, is a typical coping response to experiencing identity threat in the workplace (Petriglieri, 2011). Experiencing threat drives individuals to pursue an
anticipatory threat response in an effort to negate any further potential harm (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), which may lead to identity management strategies such as downplaying or suppressing characteristics associated with a threatened identity (Petriglieri, 2011). While there is research that suggests that individuals may engage in identity concealment as a result of identity threats that originate within the organizational context (Holmes IV et al., 2016; Petriglieri, 2011; Ramarajan & Reid, 2013), this work has not considered whether identity threats encountered outside the workplace have effects on individuals within the workplace. Given the permeability of organizational boundaries (Katz & Kahn, 1978), I argue that when individuals encounter identity threats outside of organizations, they may carry those threats with them into the workplace, thus leading individuals to cope with this threat by engaging in identity concealment.

From an affective perspective, identity labor also involves the suppression of threat related emotions. This effortful enhancing, faking, or suppressing of emotions to meet work demands or to display organizationally desired emotions during interpersonal interactions, has previously been referred to as emotion work (Hochschild, 1979) and emotional labor (Grandey, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996). While most of the research on emotional labor has centered on customer service based exchanges between employees and customers (see Grandey & Gabriel, 2015, for review), recent research suggests that employees may also engage in emotional labor within coworker interactions (Gabriel et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2013). For instance, Kim and colleagues (2013) argue that demographic diversity among team members increases emotion regulation because group members fear social rejection or appearing as if they are acting in a discriminatory manner. In a study of 274 workgroups the authors found that within teams with low levels of demographic diversity minority group
members were more likely to engage in emotion regulation within interactions with their teammates (Kim et al., 2013). This research suggests that individuals may routinely engage in emotional labor within interactions with diverse others, especially when displaying authentic emotions has the potential to highlight difference. Building on this work, I propose that in the wake of a mega-threat, identity group members may feel compelled to suppress their threat-related emotions to meet organizational emotional display rules that typically dictate that individuals do not display negative emotions like anxiety or sadness (Grandey et al., 2012), as well as to avoid highlighting their experience of dissimilar emotions from their diverse work colleagues. Based on these arguments I hypothesize the following:

*Hypothesis 2 (H2): In the aftermath of a mega-threat, being a member of the harmed identity group has a positive indirect effect on identity labor, which is mediated by anticipatory threat.*

**Step 3: Identity Labor and Work Engagement**

I further propose that identity labor has negative downstream effects on employee work engagement, or “the simultaneous investment of personal energies in the experience or performance of work” (Christian et al., 2011, p. 95). As contemporary workplaces typically require individuals to work both independently and interdependently with others to complete work tasks, scholars have begun to examine the influence of work engagement as two separate dimensions that demarcate task engagement from social engagement (Melwani & Sharma, 2018; Soane et al., 2012). Drawing from this work, and because identity labor occurs primarily in social interactions, I explore its downstream effects on two forms of work engagement: *task* engagement, the degree to which an individual invests personal energies into their individual role activities, and *social* engagement, the degree to which an individual...
seeks connections with others at work. In the section below, integrating Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement with research on identity concealment and emotional labor (Grandey, 2000; Petriglieri, 2011), I propose that identity labor reduces the three psychological conditions necessary for work engagement, preventing individuals for fully investing in both their work tasks and socially with their work colleagues.

To understand the link between identity labor and work engagement, I draw from Kahn's (1990) theory of personal engagement that argued that individuals make a conscious choice to either personally engage or disengage from a work role — and that this decision — depends on their psychological experiences within the workplace. In his qualitative study of individuals working as camp counselors and architects, Kahn (1990) proposed that employees will have high levels of personal engagement under three circumstances: when they feel as if their contributions to the workplace are valued or meaningful, when it is safe to show their true self without fear of negative repercussions, and when they possess the resources necessary to invest in their work role.

I posit the experience of identity labor negatively effects the three psychological conditions of engagement for two reasons. First, I argue that individuals engage in identity labor as a result of the perception that displaying their true authentic emotions goes against organizational norms or will lead to negative organizational consequences. This necessarily means that when an individual engages in identity labor, they have the perception that their authentic contributions will not be valued within their organizational context. Instead, individuals that engage in identity labor are doing so in order to avoid anticipated negative organizational consequences of authentic cognitive and emotional expression. Consequently, I posit that when individuals engage in identity labor, they are experiencing low levels of both
meaningfulness and safety. Second, I argue that identity labor is an effortful process that drains psychological resources (Baumeister et al., 1998). Identity labor reduces the availability of these psychological resources for investment in the workplace. As a result, I propose that when individuals engage in identity labor, they are also experiencing low levels of availability of psychological resources.

I argue that when individuals engage in identity labor it increases the likelihood that they will personally disengage from their work tasks (Kahn, 1990). When identity labor is high the psychological resources that would typically be invested in work tasks are instead diverted to concealing and suppressing true cognitions and emotions (Baumeister et al., 1998), leading to reduced task engagement. In addition, engaging in identity labor leads to lower self-disclosure and avoidance of work colleagues, especially when interactions with coworkers have the potential to highlight dissimilarity among interaction partners (Dumas et al., 2013; Prisbell & Andersen, 1980). Thus, I propose that identity labor also reduces social engagement. Based on these arguments I hypothesize the following:

Hypotheses 3a (H3a): In the aftermath of a mega-threat, being a member of the harmed identity group has a negative indirect effect on task engagement, which is mediated by anticipatory threat and identity labor.

Hypotheses 3b (H3b): In the aftermath of a mega-threat, being a member of the harmed identity group has a negative indirect effect on social engagement, which is mediated by anticipatory threat and identity labor.
CHAPTER 4: THE MODERATING ROLE OF CLOSE WORK RELATIONSHIPS

Thus far, I have argued that mega-threats have deleterious downstream effects for impacted social identity group members in the workplace. My theory suggests that mega-threats lead individuals that share identity group membership with victim(s) of the event to experience threat that then must be suppressed in the workplace, leading to higher levels of identity labor that in turn reduces both task and social engagement.

I further propose that close work relationships (Bacharach et al., 2005; Dumas et al., 2013), may provide a buffer to the negative effects of mega-threats. Positive coworker relationships have also been referred to in the literature with different nomenclature such as high quality relationships (Carmeli et al., 2009; Stephens et al., 2011), supportive peer relationships (Bacharach et al., 2005), and workplace friendships (Melwani & Sharma, 2018; Methot et al., 2016). All of these descriptors have been used to describe coworker relationships that involve reoccurring positive interactions that provide benefits such as increased physiological resources, resilience, and organizational learning (Carmeli et al., 2009; Heaphy & Dutton, 2008).

Dumas and colleagues’ (2013) characterization of close work relationships is particularly critical to my theorizing because of their emphasis on relationship closeness, which the authors’ define as the extent to which individuals feel a sense of connection and bonding with their work colleagues that goes beyond mere work tasks. Close work relationships typically involve integration and bonding experiences where relationship
partners engage in behaviors such as socializing together, sharing personal information, and discussing non-work matters (Dumas et al., 2013). Close work relationships are also characterized as relationships where individuals feel comfortable infusing aspects of their personal lives and cultural heritage into their relationships (Dumas et al., 2013).

I propose that in the aftermath of a mega-threat close work relationships attenuate the effect of anticipatory threat on identity labor in two ways. First, close work relationships provide individuals with an outlet for their negative emotions and cognitions related to a mega-threat, effectively reducing the need for suppression. When individuals encounter an emotional event they are compelled to share this experience with others (Gable & Reis, 2010; Rimé, 2009). However, the typically taboo nature of discussing negative aspects of social identity group membership in the workplace prevents the natural sharing of cognitions and emotions related to mega-threats. I propose that close work relationships provide impacted social identity group members with a safe avenue to disclose their authentic emotions related to an event, reducing the need to engage in suppressing their emotions.

Second, I argue that close work relationships help to dispel negative cognitions and emotions related to mega-threats by enabling individuals to repair or restore their threatened identity. In the wake of a mega-threat, impacted identity group members experience uncertainty regarding the value and meaning of their social identities leading them to experience anticipatory threat. Open and honest communication that focuses on reaffirming the damaged social identity may dispel this threat by switching off the negative cognitions associated with the event (Nils & Rimé, 2012). Thus, by providing individuals with a safe space to authentically express event reactions and an opportunity to reduce anticipatory threat
close work relationships reduce the need to engage in identity labor following a mega-threat.

Based on these arguments I propose the following:

*Hypothesis 4 (H4): In the aftermath of a mega-threat, the effect of anticipatory threat on identity labor is smaller for event observers that have close work relationships, which reduces the indirect effects of shared group membership on task engagement and social engagement.*
CHAPTER 5: EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF MEGA-THREATS

Overview of Empirical Strategy

In this dissertation I have proposed that mega-threats have important consequences for individuals’ cognitions, emotions, and behaviors at work. Integrating disparate literatures on attributions to discrimination, identity threat, authenticity, and work engagement I’ve built a theoretical model that explains the multi-step process through which mega-threats lead to behavioral changes in the workplace for affected identity group members. In general, it is difficult to study the influence of societal events on organizations because as Johns (2006) posited “research in organizational behavior is seldom timely enough to capture the impact of such events.” Given the lack of empirical evidence of the impact of societal events on organizations, another goal of this dissertation is to be among the first to empirically investigate the influence of mega-threats on employees in organizations. Toward this end, this dissertation presents a series of studies which investigate my hypotheses.

In an attempt to isolate the consequences of mega-threats for individuals that share identity group membership with victim(s) of the event, and to capture the effects of these events in real-time on employees in the real-world, I employed experimental, cross-sectional survey, and longitudinal survey methods to investigate my hypotheses. In Study 1, I conducted an experimental laboratory study where I examined the consequences of a mega-threat (vs. a control event), which involved an instance of sexual harassment enacted against a woman, on women and men study participants (Hypothesis 1). In my next study, Study 2, I conducted an online experimental study where I sought to replicate the results from Study 1
with another type of mega-threat under study. In this study, I examined the psychological consequences of a mega-threat vs. a control event (Hypothesis 1), and I began the process of developing my measure of identity labor by having employees predict the extent to which they would have to engage in identity labor in the workplace after hearing about the event (Hypothesis 2). Then in Study 3, I conducted an online cross-sectional field study where I further developed my measure of identity labor and tested the main effects in my model (Hypotheses 1 – 3) on individuals that were members and non-members of affected identity group after a mega-threat occurred in the real world. Finally in Study 4, I conducted an online longitudinal before and after event study where I investigated all of my hypotheses (Hypotheses 1 – 4) and I examined the causal mechanisms in my model with two different samples of participants that were members and non-members of identity groups that were affected by various mega-threats that occurred during the course of the study. In the sections below, I detail the methods and results of my four empirical studies.
Study 1: Method

The purpose of Study 1 was to investigate the psychological consequences of mega-threats. In this study, I presented participants with one of two possible news articles that I developed that either described a mega-threat or a control negative non-identity relevant event. The article that described the mega-threat detailed an incident that insinuated that a young woman was sexually harassed in the workplace by a male CEO. I expected that within the mega-threat condition women participants would experience significantly higher levels of anticipatory threat than men as a result of reading about the mega-threat (Hypothesis 1).

Participants

Participants were one hundred and eighty-three undergraduate business students that participated in a laboratory session in exchange for course credit. The sample consisted of 86 women and 97 men, was 81% White, and on average participants were 20 years old (SD = 1.06 years). Male and female participants were randomly assigned to one of two “event” conditions (0 = control condition, 1 = mega-threat condition). Accordingly, this enabled me to create four conditions based on the combination of participant gender and experimental condition (1 = male control condition, 2 = female control condition, 3 = male mega-threat condition, 4 = female mega-threat condition).

Procedure

Upon arrival to the laboratory participants were seated at individual computers and informed that they would be participating in a study that was examining the influence of societal events on individuals. As part of this study they were told that they would read an article about a recent societal event, and then answer survey questions about their reactions to the event. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of two news articles that
described an event where a male CEO was asked to testify in front of the U.S. Senate about unsafe working conditions at his firm. The manipulation of the mega-threat was contained in the article that described either a negative event that was particularly relevant for women, or a control negative event that was not identity related. In the mega-threat condition, drawing from news reporting about highly publicized instances of sexual assault in the workplace (Setoodeh & Wagmeister, 2017), the article described an event were a young woman was made to feel unsafe by a male CEO at work. In the control condition, the news article described an event where a young woman was made to feel unsafe by malfunctioning equipment within the office building (see Appendix A for the full articles).

After reading one of the articles, participants answered several survey items designed to measure the variables of interest in this study. Finally, they also filled out demographic information about their gender, race, and age.

**Measures**

Unless otherwise indicated, all items used a 7-point Likert-type scale anchored at 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. All measures are included in Appendix A.

*Independent Variable: Gender.* Participants indicated their gender by reporting whether they identified as male or female.

*Manipulation check: Gender Salience.* Drawing from the definition of mega-threats I sought to confirm that the news articles I developed differed in terms of identity relevance. Based on identity threat research, which states that identity threats are occurrences that make identity group membership salient (Steele et al., 2002; Steele & Aronson, 1995), I used a 1-item measure designed to assess gender salience. This item asked participants “while reading the article I thought about my gender.”
Dependent Variable: Anticipatory Threat. Drawing from measures of terroristic threat (Onraet et al., 2013; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013) I adapted a 3-item measure designed to assess perceptions of anticipatory threat. The items were “I worried this could happen to me”, “I worried that my gender makes me vulnerable to experiencing a situation like this”, and “was concerned I could end up in this situation because of my gender” ($\alpha = 0.89$).

Study 1: Results

Manipulation Check

I began by confirming that there were indeed differences in identity relevance between the two conditions by testing differences in gender salience. I found that gender salience was significantly higher in the mega-threat condition $F(1,167) = 40.69, p < .001$, ($M = 5.08, SD = 2.01$) as compared to the control condition ($M = 2.96, SD = 2.30$).

Hypothesis Test

To assess the influence of mega-threats on individuals who share a social identity with the victim of the event I conducted a one-way ANOVA that examined differences in anticipatory threat between men and women in each condition. Supporting Hypothesis 1, the overall model was significant $F(3,165) = 68.89, p < .001$ and contrast testing revealed that women in the mega-threat condition experienced significantly higher anticipatory threat ($M = 5.95, SD = 1.20$) than men in the mega-threat condition ($M = 2.27, SD = 1.33$), $t(165) = 12.728, p < .001$, women in the control condition ($M = 4.08, SD = 1.50$), $t(165) = 6.22, p < .001$, and men in the control condition ($M = 2.36, SD = 1.52$), $t(165) = 12.19, p < .001$. See Figure 2 for graphical depiction of results.

In sum, the results of Study 1 provide initial support for the hypothesis that women experience significantly higher levels of anticipatory threat as a result of sharing a social
identity with a woman that was harmed during a mega-threat. To further probe this relationship and to develop a measure of identity labor I ran a second study using similar methods comparing the reactions of Black and White Americans to a different type of mega-threat.
Study 2: Method

In Study 2, I sought to replicate the results of Study 1 with a different mega-threat under study. In this experimental study I specifically recruited participants that were employed and self-identified as either Black or White. I used similar methods to those employed in Study 1 by presenting participants with one of two possible news articles that I developed for this study to describe either a mega-threat or a control non-identity relevant event. In the mega-threat condition, participants were presented with a news article that described a police shooting of a Black victim. In the control condition, participants were presented with a news article that described a police encounter where a Black victim died of electrocution. In this study, I also began the process of developing my measure of identity labor by having participants predict the extent to which they would have to engage in identity labor in the workplace after hearing about the event they read about. I predicted that the interactive effect of reading about a mega-threat, in which a Black victim was harmed, and participant race, or being a Black participant, would lead to higher levels of anticipatory threat (Hypothesis 1). I also predicted that there would be a positive indirect effect of the interaction between condition and participant race on experiences of identity labor, such that Black participants in the mega-threat condition would anticipate that their experience of anticipatory threat would spill over into the workplace leading them to engage in significantly higher levels of identity labor (Hypothesis 2).

Participants

Participants were 197 individuals who responded to a five minute online study in exchange for a nominal payment on Amazon turkprime (Litman et al., 2017). In order to participate in this study individuals must have self-identified as either Black or White, and
indicated that they were employed outside of Amazon Mechanical Turk for at least 20 hours a week. This demographic data was collected by turkprime when individuals register to use the website (Litman et al., 2017), and was used to display the study to participants on the website that met the study criteria. Using quota sampling techniques (Singleton et al., 1993), I sought to recruit an equal number of Black and White participants to participate in the study. The final sample consisted of 96 Black participants and 101 White participants, 52% were women, the mean age was 35 years old \( (SD = 10.29) \), and 65% had an associate degree or higher. The participants were randomly assigned to one of two “event” conditions \((0 = \text{control condition}, 1 = \text{mega-threat condition})\). Accordingly, this enabled me to create four overarching conditions based on the combination of participant race and experimental condition \((1 = \text{White control condition}, 2 = \text{Black control condition}, 3 = \text{White mega-threat condition}, 4 = \text{Black mega-threat condition})\).

**Procedure**

Similar to Study 1, participants were told that they would be participating in a study about the influence of societal events on individuals. In this study, participants were presented with a news article and instructed to imagine that they had read this article on their way to work. In both conditions, participants read about a deadly incident in a city named Greenville where a Black man named Jamal Jackson died after encountering police in his backyard.

The manipulation of the mega-threat was contained in the articles where participants were randomly assigned to read one of two news articles that described either an identity relevant (mega-threat) or a non-identity relevant (control) event. In the mega-threat condition, drawing from news reporting about the shooting of Stephon Clark in Sacramento,
CA in March of 2018 (Winton et al., 2018), participants read about an unarmed Black man that was shot and killed by police after they mistakenly thought that the victim’s cell phone was a gun. In the control condition participants read about a Black man that encountered police officers, was surprised, and died of electrocution as a result of a downed powerline that was in his backyard (See Appendix B).

Similar to Study 1, after reading one of the articles, participants answered several survey items designed to assess their reactions to the event. Finally, they also filled out demographic information about their gender, race, education, and age.

**Measures**

Unless otherwise indicated, all items used a 7-point Likert-type scale anchored at 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. All measures are included in Appendix B.

*Independent Variable: Race.* Participants indicated their race by reporting whether they self-identified as Black or White.

*Manipulation Check: Attributions to Race.* In this study, I sought to further refine my manipulation check. Drawing from research on personal attributions to discrimination (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002; McCoy & Major, 2003), I developed a 3-item measure to assess the extent to which participants attributed the cause of the deadly incident to the identity (race) of the victim. The items were: “race was an important part of this event”, “racism was a contributing factor to this event”, and “race had very little to do with the event (reverse coded)” ($\alpha = 0.91$).

*Mediator Variable: Anticipatory Threat.* I measured anticipatory threat with the same 3-item measure that was used in Study 1 ($\alpha = 0.91$; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013; Onraet et al., 2013).
Dependent Variable: Identity Labor – Scale Development Phase 1. In this study, I purposefully recruited a sample of working adults in order to assess differences in anticipated identity labor between Black and White employees. In this section of the survey, participants were reminded that they should be imagining that they had read the news article on their way to work, and then they were instructed to respond to a 14-item measure that I developed to assess identity labor.

Given that I have argued that identity labor is a combination of identity concealment and emotional suppression in the workplace, I began with Brotheridge and Lee’s (2003) and Grandey’s (2003) validated scales of emotional suppression (or surface acting) as the starting point for my measure of identity labor. I adapted these measures and added new measures to ensure that the items described feeling as if you must suppress authentic emotions that may be experienced as a result of the event within the workplace and in interactions with work colleagues. Sample items for the emotional labor portion of the scale include, “resist expressing my true emotions with work colleagues” and “hide how I feel from my coworkers”. Next, I developed new items to assess identity concealment or suppression that were designed to capture the extent to which respondents believed that they would have to suppress their authentic identity related thoughts about the event while interacting with their colleagues at work. Sample items for the cognitive labor portion of the scale include “resist expressing my true thoughts with my work colleagues” and “steer clear of discussing the event with my work colleagues”. These items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale anchored at 1 = not at all to 7 = a great deal.

As this represents a first step in the development and validation of a measure of identity labor, I conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using principal axis
factoring and oblim rotation (Kim & Mueller, 1984) as a means of examining the factor structure of my identity labor scale. The EFA extracted 2 factors, with eigenvalues greater than 1, which accounted for 70% of the variance. The factor that accounted for the largest amount of variance (41%) was labeled “cognitive labor” because the factor contained all the items related to suppressing authentic cognitions and avoiding discussions about the event. The second factor, which accounted for 29% of the variance, was labeled “emotional labor” because the factor contained all the items related to suppressing authentic emotional reactions to the event. All items in the scale demonstrated sufficiently high item loadings and there were no items that had cross-factor loadings greater than 0.30 (Fabrigar et al., 1999); thus, all the items were retained in the final scale. The resulting 14-item measure of identity labor that was used in Study 2 (and the remaining studies in this paper) is presented in Table 1, with scale descriptive statistics, item loadings, and item reliabilities.

**Study 2: Results**

**Manipulation Check**

To confirm that there were differences in causal attributions to race between the two conditions I examined and found that attributions to race were significantly higher in the mega-threat condition \( F(1,195) = 101.1, p < .001, (M = 5.44, SD = 1.70) \) as compared to those in the control condition \( (M = 2.85, SD = 1.90) \).

**Hypothesis Tests**

To assess the influence of mega-threats on individuals who share a social identity with the victim of the event I conducted a one-way ANOVA that examined differences in anticipatory threat among Black participants in the mega-threat condition, White participants in the mega-threat condition and Black and White participants in the control condition.
Supporting Hypothesis 1, the overall model was significant $F(3,193) = 29.04, p < .001$ and contrast testing revealed that Black participants in the mega-threat condition experienced significantly higher anticipatory threat ($M = 5.24, SD = 1.90$) than White participants in the mega-threat condition ($M = 2.46, SD = 1.51$), $t(193) = 8.06, p < .001$, Black participants in the control condition ($M = 3.62, SD = 1.95$), $t(193) = 4.72, p < .001$, and White participants in the control condition ($M = 2.39, SD = 1.34$), $t(193) = 8.14, p < .001$. See Figure 3 for graphical depiction of the results.

To assess the spillover effects of mega-threats on individuals at work, I first ran a one-way ANOVA that examined differences in identity labor among Black participants in the mega-threat condition, White participants in the mega-threat condition and Black and White participants in the control condition. The overall model was not significant $F(3,193) = 2.06, p = 0.11$ and contrast testing revealed that there were no significant differences in the mega of identity labor by condition or participant race (see Figure 4). This result was not very surprising as I did not predict a main effect of mega-threats on identity labor. Instead, I predicted that anticipatory threat mediates the relationship between mega-threats and identity labor such that individuals that experience higher levels of anticipatory threat after a mega-threat would engage in higher levels of identity labor. To assess this prediction (Hypothesis 2) I ran a bootstrapped moderated mediation analysis (Hayes, 2018) using the LAVANN package in R (Rosseel, 2012). Regression results are presented in Table 2. Supporting Hypothesis 2, bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples revealed that the higher level of anticipatory threat experienced by Black participants in the mega-threat condition spilled over into the workplace leading these participants to indicate that they would have to engage in significantly higher levels of identity labor in the workplace, where the moderated
mediation coefficient = 0.47, \( p < .01 \), \( SE = 0.17 \), and the 95% C.I. [0.15, 0.84] (see Figure 5).

In sum, the results from Study 2 demonstrate that mega-threats have a unique influence on individuals who share social identities with victims of the event; and provides initial evidence that mega-threats lead these individuals to engage in identity labor in the workplace.
Study 3: Method

The results of Study 2 represent an initial step in developing a validated measure of identity labor. These results also provided preliminary evidence of the spillover effects of mega-threats on individuals at work. In Study 3, I sought to further validate my measure of identity labor, by conducting a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), and I sought to further examine the spillover effects of mega-threats on individuals at work by investigating the impact of a real-world mega-threat on employees (Hypotheses 1 – 3). To this end, in Study 3 I conducted an online study with employees after the occurrence of a mega-threat.

Mega-Threat Under Study

In order to assess the influence of mega-threats on employees I first needed to stay up to date on events that were happening in the world and be prepared to collect data after a mega-threat occurred. The mega-threat that I chose to examine in this study occurred on July 14, 2019 when the President of the United States posted a series of tweets about four Democratic congresswomen. In his tweets the President wrote “So interesting to see ‘Progressive’ Democrat Congresswomen, who originally came from countries whose governments are a complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere in the world (if they have a functioning government at all), now loudly … and viciously telling the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful nation on earth, how our government should be run. Why don’t they go back and help fix the totally crime infested places from which they came. Then come back and show us how it’s done.”

I determined that this event was a mega-threat because the features of this event align with the three defining features of mega-threats. First, this event received significant media attention, evidenced by the significant amount of discussion the tweets garnered on both
twitter and other social media outlets (Rogers & Fandos, 2019). Additionally, this series of
tweets was the subject of 183 online news articles published by local, state, and national
news outlets over a 3-day period immediately after the event. Second, these comments were
negative in that they were meant to insult the four Congresswomen. In fact, many media
outlets referred to these tweets as racist in their coverage of the event (Rogers & Fandos,
2019). Third, and relatedly, this event was identity related because the insult within the
tweets was meant to insinuate that the four Congresswomen were less American than other
citizens of the United States (Rogers & Fandos, 2019). In response to this event many
individuals made attributions that the President singled out the Congresswomen because they
are members of minority identity groups in the U.S. For example, in reaction to this event
scores of Americans that are immigrants or members of racial minority groups in the posted
on social media about their personal experiences of being the target of the insult “go back to
your country” throughout their lives (Rogers & Fandos, 2019; Shao, 2019).

Thus, I collected data over a five-day period after this event to examine the
differential effects of this mega-threat on immigrants and racial minorities that frequently
encounter insults like the insult contained in the tweets in their everyday life, as compared to
White individuals who may not ever be the victim of this type of insult.

Participants

Participants were 432 individuals who responded to a ten-minute study on Amazon
Turkprime in exchange for a nominal payment (Litman et al., 2017). Similar to Study 2, I
employed quota sampling techniques to recruit employees living in the United States that
either identified as White non-immigrants ($N = 204$) or first/second/third generation
immigrants ($N = 227$). Of the 227 individuals that identified as first, second, or third
generation immigrants about 55% were of Asian descent and 35% were of Hispanic descent. 47% of the sample was women, the mean age was 37 years old ($SD = 22.0$ years), and 68% held an associate degree or higher.

**Procedure**

Participants were told that they would be participating in a study that was about the influence of societal events on people at work. After consenting to participate in the study participants were shown a short excerpt from a news report about the mega-threat (Rogers & Fandos, 2019, see Appendix C), including a snapshot that contained the tweets that were posted by the President. Next, participants were asked to react to the event by writing 2-3 sentences about their thoughts, feelings, and experiences in the few days since this event had occurred. Then, participants were presented with survey items designed to assess their experiences of anticipatory threat and the salience of their immigration status over the past few days. Next, participants were told that the study was also about their experiences in the workplace over the past few days and they responded to several survey items about their experiences in the workplace in the days following the event. Finally, participants filled out demographic information including their race, gender, age, and educational attainment.

**Measures**

Unless otherwise indicated, all items used a 7-point Likert-type scale anchored at 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. All measures are included in Appendix C.

*Independent Variable: Immigration status.* Given the importance of immigration to the mega-threat in this study, I created a dummy variable designed to capture immigration status within the sample. Participants that identified themselves as non-immigrants were coded as 0, while those that identified as first, second, or third generation immigrants were
coded as 1. Furthermore, to ensure that participants were at least minimally aware of the U.S. President’s tweets I asked a screening question (“Have you heard of this event before reading this article?”, yes/no). 85% of the sample reported that they had heard of the event. The results reported below focus on the participants that responded yes to this screening question.

**Mediator: Anticipatory Threat.** I measured anticipatory threat with the same 3-item measure that was used in Study 1 and 2 ($\alpha = 0.89$; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013; Onraet et al., 2013).

**Mediator: Identity Labor – Scale Development Phase 2.** I measured identity labor using the 14-item measure that I developed in Study 2. The items used a 7-point Likert scale anchored at 1 = not at all to 7 = a great deal. In addition, to continue validating my measure of identity labor I collected measures of several constructs that are related to identity labor including: facades of conformity (Hewlin, 2009), authenticity (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014), and identity suppression (Madera et al., 2012). I also collected several measures that identity labor should theoretically predict including: job satisfaction (Wanous et al., 1997), organizational commitment (Tepper et al., 2004), and turnover intentions (Tepper et al., 2009). These items were used to perform a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and an examination of the validity of my identity labor measure.

**Dependent Variable: Task Engagement.** Drawing from prior research that has demonstrated the validity of using a shortened scale to measure work engagement participants responded to Barnes and colleagues (2015) 3-item measure of engagement. The items were “I worked with intensity at my job”, “I felt interested in my job”, and “I devoted a lot of attention to my job” ($\alpha = 0.86$; Barnes, Lucianetti, Bhave, & Christian, 2015).
**Dependent Variable: Social Engagement.** To measure social engagement, I adapted the social engagement subscale of Soane and colleagues’ (2012) ISA work engagement scale which assesses the extent to which one is socially connected to their work environment and shares common values with their work colleagues. The items were “I sought out connections with my work colleagues”, “I enjoyed spending time with my coworkers”, and “I sought out opportunities to work on tasks with others” ($\alpha = 0.92$; Soane et al., 2012).

**Study 3: Results**

**Test of Hypothesis 1**

Table 3 includes the means, standard deviations, and correlations amongst the variables in this study. To examine the differential effect of this mega-threat on individuals who identified as immigrants as compared to those who do not, I began by conducting a regression analysis with the immigration status variable as the independent variable and anticipatory threat as the dependent variable. In support of Hypothesis 1, I found that the overall model was significant $F(1,363) = 75.33, p < .001$, and contrast testing revealed that participants that identified as immigrants experienced significantly higher levels of anticipatory threat ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.88$) than non-immigrant participants ($M = 1.86, SD = 1.23$), $t(363) = 8.68, p < .001$.

**Identity Labor CFA Analysis**

To further assess the validity of my measure of identity labor I ran a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Factor loadings for the 14-items are presented in Table 4. Model fit was evaluated by examining the chi-square statistic, comparative fit index (CFI), root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Following recommendations set forth by Hu and Bentler (1999), for all structural
models in this paper (including the CFA analysis) I determined that model fit was acceptable when the CFI is greater than 0.90, RMSEA equals 0.08 or less, and the SRMR is less than 0.08 (fair fit when SRMR is less than 0.10). In particular for the CFA analysis, the proposed two factor model fit the data well: $\chi^2(76) = 274.80, p < .001; \text{CFI} = 0.97; \text{RMSEA} = 0.078, 90\% \text{ C.I.} [0.07, 0.08]; \text{SRMR} = 0.03$. This model fit the data significantly better ($\Delta \chi^2(1) = 1,480.3, p < .001$) than a single factor model with all of the items loaded onto one factor ($\chi^2(77) = 1,755.07, p < .001; \text{CFI} = 0.75; \text{RMSEA} = 0.23; \text{SRMR} = 0.20$).

Next, I ran a series of analysis to assess discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity. First, to assess convergent validity it was necessary to demonstrate the correlation of identity labor with scales that measure similar constructs (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). I have argued that identity labor involves the suppression of emotions and cognitions related to your identity. Theoretically this construct should be positively related to facades of conformity – the suppression of personal values and the creation of false representations to appear as if an employee embraces organizational values (Hewlin, 2009) – and more general forms of identity suppression that individuals typically may engage in to fit in within the workplace (Madera et al., 2012). In addition, identity labor should be negatively related to workplace authenticity or the degree to which a person acts in agreement with one’s true self in the workplace (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014).

I found that identity labor is moderately related to, but distinct from facades of conformity ($r = 0.60, p < .001$) and identity suppression ($r = 0.44, p < .001$). I also found as expected that identity labor was negatively related to, and distinct from, workplace authenticity ($r = -0.50, p < .001$). Next, to assess predictive validity it is necessary to demonstrate that the identity labor scale predicts organizational outcomes as expected.
identity labor negatively predicts job satisfaction ($r = -0.50, p < .001$) and organizational commitment ($r = -0.47, p < .001$), and positively predicts turnover intentions ($r = 0.39, p < .001$).

Finally, to assess the discriminant validity of the identity labor scale I ran a CFA analysis involving the identity labor, facades of conformity, and identity suppression scale. Results indicated that model fit was best for the four factor model where identity labor was loaded onto two factors, one for cognitive labor and another for emotional labor, and facades of conformity and identity suppression were loaded onto separate factors ($\chi^2 (246) = 720.48, p < .001; \text{CFI} = 0.93; \text{RMSEA} = 0.08; \text{SRMR} = 0.07$). This model fit the data significantly better ($\Delta \chi^2 (6) = 916.10, p < .001$) than a single factor model with all of the items loaded onto one factor ($\chi^2 (252) = 1,635.59, p < .001; \text{CFI} = 0.81; \text{RMSEA} = 0.13; \text{SRMR} = 0.09$) and also significantly better ($\Delta \chi^2 (5) = 711.72, p < .001$) than a two factor model with facades of conformity and identity suppression loaded onto the same factor as cognitive labor ($\chi^2 (252) = 1,432.20, p < .001; \text{CFI} = 0.83; \text{RMSEA} = 0.12; \text{SRMR} = 0.09$). Taken together, these analyses provide evidence for the validity of my identity labor measure.

**Test of Hypotheses 2 & 3**

To test whether anticipatory threat mediated the effect of immigration status on identity labor I conducted a bootstrapped mediation analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Hayes, 2013; MacKinnon et al., 2007) using the LAVANN package in R (Rosseel, 2012). Results are presented in Table 5. Supporting Hypothesis 2, bootstrapping 1,000 resamples revealed that the indirect effect of immigration status on identity labor through anticipatory threat was
significant (indirect effect = 0.46, \(SE = 0.10\), 95% C.I. [0.30, 0.69]), results are presented in Figure 6).

Finally, to test my hypotheses about the influence of mega-threats on employee task and social engagement I ran a structural equation model analysis using the LAVAAN package in R. Results are presented in Tables 5 and 6. Supporting Hypothesis 3a, I found that the President’s tweets had important downstream consequences for immigrants working in the U.S. leading them to have lower levels of task engagement, such that the total effect of immigration status on task engagement was marginally significant (total effect = -0.03, \(SE = 0.02\), 95% C.I. [-0.09, 0.00], 90% C.I. [-0.09, -0.006]). Also supporting Hypothesis 3b, I found that the mega-threat had similar effects on immigrants social engagement, such that the total effect of immigration status on social engagement was significant (total effect = -0.10, \(SE = 0.03\), 95% C.I. [-0.18, -0.05]). The results of this analysis are presented in Figure 7.

In sum, the results of Study 3 demonstrate that mega-threats have a significant influence on employees that identify with the victims of the event, leading these employees to engage in higher levels of identity labor, that ultimately reduces task and social engagement in the workplace.
Study 4: Method

The results of Study 3 provide compelling evidence in support of my hypotheses of the spillover effects of mega-threats on individuals at work. In Study 4, I sought to replicate these results and examine the causal effects of mega-threats on employees at work. I also sought to investigate the moderating effect of close work relationships on the effects of mega-threats on individuals at work (Hypothesis 4).

To this end, in Study 4 I conducted a longitudinal before and after event study that allowed me to examine the differential effects that real-world mega-threats have on employees that are either members or non-members of identity groups that are harmed within a mega-threat. Given my investigation of events that occur in the real world, it was critical for me to begin by recruiting a diverse sample of employees at Time 1 that then allowed me to follow up with individuals within different identity groups based on the features of the events that occurred during the course of the study.

Over the course of this study, mega-threats occurred that specifically impacted U.S. immigrants and Black Americans. Thus, below I first describe my procedure for recruiting a large diverse initial sample of participants. Next, I describe my procedure for identifying mega-threats that specifically impacted immigrants living in the U.S., and I describe the procedure I followed to assess the influence of these events on a subsample of U.S. immigrants and non-immigrants from my original sample. Then, I describe my procedure for identifying mega-threats that specifically impacted Black Americans, and I describe how I assessed the influence of these events on a subsample of Black and White participants from my initial sample. Finally, I report the measures and results of the longitudinal investigation I conducted for both samples.
Procedure

**Time 1 Sample.** To begin to investigate the causal effects of mega-threats on employees, I first sought to recruit a diverse sample of employees that identified with various identity groups. Given that recent mega-threats in the U.S., such as the shooting of unarmed Black civilians by police, highly publicized instances of sexual harassment, and the separation of children at the U.S./Mexico border, are particularly relevant for Black Americans, women, and U.S. immigrants (Leigh & Melwani, 2019) I sought to recruit a sample that would allow for a longitudinal investigation of the influence that mega-threats have on employees that belong to these specific identity groups in the U.S.

In the initial Time 1 survey in May 2019, I used quota sampling techniques to recruit $N = 728$ employees on Amazon Turkprime (Litman et al., 2017). During recruitment I targeted participants that were living in the U.S., employed, and were members of a specific identity group. For example, when recruiting Black participants, I specifically recruited individuals that were employed, self-identified as Black/African-American, and were living in the U.S. I allowed other characteristics about the participants such as their gender, age, or education to vary.

The total sample of 728 employees included subsamples of employees that identified as follows: $N = 201$ Black participants, $N = 109$ U.S. immigrants, $N = 400$ White participants, and $N = 18$ that participants that identified as other race. At Time 1 the full sample of $N = 728$ participants was 51% women, the mean age was 37 years old ($SD = 10.68$ years), and 72% held an associate degree or higher. At Time 1, participants responded to a survey that asked them to report their general experiences of identity labor, task, and social engagement in the workplace, along with other measures designed to assess participant demographics and
their close work relationships. This large sample allowed me the flexibility to examine the effects of a variety of potential mega-threats after they occurred on individuals that share identity group membership with victims of the events.

**Sample A: Immigrant Subsample.** For subsample A, I collected data at two additional time points based on mega-threats that occurred in the U.S. that involved victims or targets that were U.S. immigrants. On June 23, 2019 medical doctors published a report about the conditions of border detention facilities that housed unaccompanied children at the U.S./Mexico border. In this report the doctors compared conditions at the facilities to “torture” given that the facilities deprived children of basic human needs like clean water, food, and healthcare (Marshall et al., 2019). After the publication of this report multiple local, state, and national news outlets published news articles and had televised newscasts that publicized this report. These news articles received significant attention on social media (Marshall et al., 2019).

I determined that this event was a mega-threat that was particularly relevant for U.S. immigrants because the event (a.) received significant media attention, (b.) was negative in that it related the conditions at the facilities to torture, and (c.) it was identity relevant given that immigrants in the U.S. are more likely to have familial or community connections to individuals that have been or are at risk for being held in these facilities, or have personal experience with being held within these types of border facilities. Thus, in the days after this mega-threat I contacted the $N = 109$ U.S. immigrants from my original Time 1 sample, and a matched subsample of $N = 110$ White Americans randomly drawn from the $N = 400$ possible White participants from the original Time 1 sample. At Time 2, participants responded to a series of survey items designed to assess their reactions to the mega-threat including: their
current experiences of anticipatory threat, identity labor, and their task and social engagement in the workplace.

Finally, Time 3 of this study was in July 2019 during the days following the series of tweets posted by the U.S. President, referenced in Study 3. Given that the sample in Study 4 represented a different sample of immigrants from the sample in Study 3, I was able to assess the influence of this same mega-threat on a separate group of U.S. immigrants. At Time 3, I again contacted the $N = 109$ U.S. immigrants and the $N = 110$ White Americans that were contacted at Time 2 to participate in a Time 3 survey. The Time 3 survey was designed to assess the same measures as the Time 2 survey.

**Sample B: Race Subsample.** During this study there were two mega-threats that occurred in the U.S. that I determined were especially important for Black Americans. The first mega-threat occurred on October 2, 2019 when Amber Guyer was sentenced to 10 years in prison for the murder of a Black man named Botham Jean. Earlier in the week Amber Guyer was found guilty of murder for fatally shooting Botham Jean in his Dallas, TX apartment, which she asserts happened because she mistook Jean’s apartment for her own and thought that Jean was an intruder (McLaughlin, 2019). Given Amber’s position as a Dallas, Texas police officer at the time of the shooting in September 2018, the shooting death and the subsequent trial garnered significant media attention (McLaughlin, 2019). The second mega-threat occurred just 10-days later when a Black woman named Atatiana Jefferson was shot and killed by a police officer in her Fort Worth, Texas home. Police were called to Jefferson’s home to do a wellness check, when during their search of the perimeter of the house they saw someone standing in the window of the home and opened fire (CNN Wire, 2019).
I determined that both of these events met the criteria to be considered mega-threats as they (a.) received significant media attention, (b.) were especially negative – as the murder trial was the result of the death of Botham Jean and Atatiana Jefferson was also killed by police –, and these events were (c.) identity related because both of the victims of these police shootings were Black. In addition, these events are also identity relevant because Black Americans are five times as likely as White Americans to be shot by police (Buehler, 2017; Leigh & Melwani, 2019). In addition, there is evidence that demonstrates that police shootings of Black civilians results in decreased mental health outcomes for Black Americans (Bor et al., 2018). Thus, I also collected data at a second time point to assess the influence of these events on Black participants and a matched subsample of White participants from my Time 1 sample.

Given that these events occurred within ten days of each other I collected data at one single time point (Time 2) in the days following the death of Atatiana Jefferson from October 18 – 23, 2019. At Time 2 I contacted $N = 201$ Black participants from my Time 1 survey, plus a matched subsample of $N = 203$ White participants from the possible $N = 400$ White participants from my Time 1 sample. This Time 2 survey was designed to assess the same items as the survey administered to subsample A.

**Participants**

**Subsample A Participants.** As described above this study began with a large sample of $N = 728$ employees living in the U.S. at Time 1, and then focused specifically on U.S. immigrants and a comparison group subsample for Time 2 and Time 3. At Time 2 $N = 67$ U.S. immigrants and $N = 87$ non-immigrants responded to the survey, representing a 70% response rate at Time 2 of the total $N = 219$ participants from the original Time 1 survey that
were contacted. At Time 2 the sample was 46% women, the mean age was 38 years old ($SD = 10.63$ years), and 73% held an associate degree or higher. Finally, at Time 3, $N = 59$ U.S. immigrants and $N = 82$ non-immigrants responded to the survey, representing a 64% response rate from the total $N = 217$ that were contacted. At Time 3 the sample was 48% women, the mean age was 39 years old ($SD = 10.89$ years), and 74% held an associate degree or higher.

**Subsample B Participants.** This study also began with the full $N = 728$ sample and then focused specifically on Black participants and a comparison group subsample for Time 2. At Time 2 $N = 103$ Black participants and $N = 101$ White participants responded to the survey, representing a 49% response rate at Time 2 of the total $N = 404$ participants from the original Time 1 survey that were contacted. While the response rate for subsample B was significantly lower than for subsample A, the amount of time between the time points was also significantly longer for subsample B (~5 months for subsample B vs. ~2 months for subsample A). This longer time frame typically leads to a lower response rate (Freedman et al., 1980), and there did not seem to be significant differences in the demographics or Time 1 measures between participants that responded at Time 2 compared with those that did not. At Time 2 the sample was 51% women, the mean age was 38 years old ($SD = 11.24$ years), and 67% held an associate degree or higher.

**Measures**

The surveys were designed such that each subsample received the same measures. Except for anticipatory threat, all measures were assessed at every time point. Unless otherwise indicated, all items used a 7-point Likert-type scale anchored at 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. All measures are included in Appendix D.
Independent Variable Immigration status and Race. For subsample A, I created a dummy variable for immigration status (0 = non-immigrant and 1 = U.S. immigrant) based on the subsample that each participant belonged to during recruitment. For subsample B, I created a dummy variable for race (0 = White Participants, 1 = Black participants) based on the subsample that each participant belonged to during recruitment. Furthermore, to ensure that participants were at least minimally aware of the mega-threats that this study centered upon I asked a screening question (“Have you heard of this event before reading this article?”, yes/no) at Time 2 and Time 3. For subsample A 64% of the sample reported that heard of the Time 2 event and 79% of the sample reported that they heard of the Time 3 event. For subsample B 83% of the Time 2 sample reported that they heard of the event. The results reported below focus on the participants that responded yes to this screening question.

Mediator: Anticipatory Threat. I measured anticipatory threat with the same 3-item measure that was used in the previous studies at Time 2 and Time 3 (T2 \( \alpha = 0.91 \), T3 \( \alpha = 0.94 \); (Onraet et al., 2013; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013).

Mediator: Identity Labor. I measured identity labor using the 14-item measure that I developed in Study 2 and 3 at all three timepoints. At Time 1 the scale measured participant’s general experiences of identity labor in the workplace. At Time 2 and Time 3 the scale measured participant’s engagement in identity labor in the few days immediately after the mega-threats. As in previous studies, the items used a 7-point Likert scale anchored at 1 = not at all to 7 = a great deal (T1 \( \alpha = 0.98 \), T2 \( \alpha = 0.94 \), T3 \( \alpha = 0.95 \)).

Dependent Variable: Task Engagement. I measured task engagement at all three time points using the same scale from Study 3. Similar to identity labor Time 1 measured
general task engagement, while Time 2 and Time 3 measured task engagement in the past few days (T1 $\alpha = 0.93$, T2 $\alpha = 0.95$, T3 $\alpha = 0.88$; Barnes et al. 2015).

**Dependent Variable: Social Engagement.** I measured social engagement at all three time points using the same scale from Study 3. Time 1 measured general social engagement, while Time 2 and Time 3 measured social engagement in the past few days (T1 $\alpha = 0.84$, T2 $\alpha = 0.86$, T3 $\alpha = 0.90$; Soane et al., 2012).

**Moderator variable: Close work relationships.** I measured close workplace relationships at Time 1 with a 6-item scale adapted from Sias and Cahill (1998) which measures the strength of friendships. Sample items from this scale are “I have formed strong friendships at work” and “I can confide in people at work” ($\alpha = 0.91$).

**Study 4: Results**

**Subsample A Results**

Means, standard deviations, and correlations between variables for both subsamples can be found in Table 7. To examine the differential effects of mega-threats involving immigrants on U.S. immigrant and non-immigrant employees, I began by conducting a regression analysis with immigration status as the independent variable and anticipatory threat at Time 2 and Time 3 as the dependent variable. In support of Hypothesis 1, I found that U.S. immigrants experienced significantly higher levels of anticipatory threat at Time 2 $F(1,95) = 6.24, p = .01 (M = 3.21, SD = 1.94)$ than non-immigrant participants ($M = 2.30, SD = 1.67$). I also found support for Hypothesis 1 at Time 3 where U.S. immigrants experienced significantly higher levels of anticipatory threat $F(1,110) = 12.0, p < .001 (M = 3.48, SD = 1.96)$ than non-immigrant participants ($M = 2.25, SD = 1.78$).
Next, to test my prediction that immigrants would engage in higher levels of identity labor than non-immigrants, and that this relationship is mediated by anticipatory threat I ran a bootstrapped mediation analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Hayes, 2013; MacKinnon et al., 2007). Results are presented in Tables 8 and 9. Supporting Hypothesis 2, bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples revealed that the indirect effect of immigration status on identity labor at Time 2 through anticipatory threat at Time 2 was significant (indirect effect = 0.28, $SE = 0.14$, 95% C.I. [0.06, 0.62], see Figure 8). Importantly, while immigrants experienced significantly higher levels of identity labor at Time 2 ($M_{U.S.\, immigrants} = 3.44$, $SD_{U.S.\, immigrants} = 1.35$; $M_{non-immigrants} = 2.82$, $SD_{non-immigrants} = 1.71$; $t(94) = 1.92, p = .05$) and at Time 3 ($M_{U.S.\, immigrants} = 3.64$, $SD_{U.S.\, immigrants} = 1.66$; $M_{non-immigrants} = 2.59$, $SD_{non-immigrants} = 1.61$; $t(110) = 3.34, p = .001$) there were not significant differences in identity labor at Time 1 ($M_{U.S.\, immigrants} = 3.67$, $SD_{U.S.\, immigrants} = 1.47$; $M_{non-immigrants} = 3.10$, $SD_{non-immigrants} = 1.76$; $t(110) = 1.82, p = .07$). This is further evidence of the causal effect of mega-threats on identity labor.

To test my hypotheses about the influence of mega-threats on employee task and social engagement I ran a time lagged structural equation model analysis using the LAVAAN package in R. Structural modeling results suggested that the hypothesized model fit the data relatively well as evidenced by the non-significant chi-square statistic ($\chi^2 (5) = 3.59, p = 0.61$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = 0.0; SRMR = 0.05). Results are presented in Tables 8 and 9. Supporting Hypothesis 3a, I found that the mega-threat had important downstream consequences for U.S. immigrants leading them to have significantly lower levels of task engagement, such that the total effect of immigration status on task engagement at Time 3 through anticipatory threat at Time 2 and identity labor at Time 2 was significant (total effect = -0.05, $SE = 0.04$, 95% C.I. [-0.17, -0.004]). However, I did not find support for Hypothesis
3b. The total effect of immigration status on social engagement at Time 3 through anticipatory threat at Time 2 and identity labor at Time 2 was not significant (total effect = -0.02, SE = 0.04, 95% C.I. [-0.12, 0.04], see Figure 9).

Finally, to test my hypothesis about the moderating effect of close work relationships on the relationship between anticipatory threat and identity labor I added close work relationships as a moderator to the structural model that I ran above. Results are presented in Table 10. Close work relationships did not significantly moderate the effect of anticipatory threat at Time 2 on identity labor at Time 2 ($b = 0.02, p = .27$). In fact, there was not a significant relationship between close work relationships and anticipatory threat at Time 2 ($r = -0.06, p = 0.55$) or identity labor at Time 2 ($r = -0.12, p = 0.23$). Thus, I did not find evidence to support the prediction that close work relationships moderate the effect of anticipatory threat on identity labor (Hypothesis 4).

**Subsample B Results**

To examine the differential effects of mega-threats involving Black Americans on Black and White individuals at work, I began by conducting a regression analysis with race as the independent variable and anticipatory threat at Time 2 as the dependent variable. In support of Hypothesis 1, I found that Black participants experienced significantly higher levels of anticipatory threat $F(1,167) = 106.1, p < .001$ ($M = 4.73, SD = 1.85$) than White participants ($M = 2.17, SD = 1.31$).

Next, to test my prediction that mega-threats lead Black employees to engage in higher levels of identity labor than White employees, and that this relationship is mediated by anticipatory threat I ran a bootstrapped mediation analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Hayes, 2013; MacKinnon et al., 2007). Results are presented in Tables 11 and 12. Supporting
Hypothesis 2, bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples revealed that the indirect effect of race on identity labor at Time 2 through anticipatory threat at Time 2 was significant (indirect effect = 0.80, SE = 0.17, 95% C.I. [0.51, 1.15], see Figure 10). Importantly, while Black employees experienced significantly higher levels of identity labor at Time 2 than White employees ($M_{\text{Black Participants}} = 3.26$, $SD_{\text{Black Participants}} = 1.70$; $M_{\text{White participants}} = 2.68$, $SD_{\text{White participants}} = 1.52$; $t(167) = 5.42 p = .02$) there were not significant differences in identity labor at Time 1 ($M_{\text{Black Participants}} = 3.57$, $SD_{\text{Black Participants}} = 1.71$; $M_{\text{White Participants}} = 3.20$, $SD_{\text{White participants}} = 1.57$; $t(168) = 1.44 p = .15$). This is further evidence of the casual effect of mega-threats on identity labor in the workplace.

To test my hypotheses about the downstream effects of mega-threats on employee task and social engagement I ran a structural equation model analysis using the LAVAAN package in R. Structural modeling results suggested that the hypothesized model fit the data well as evidenced by the non-significant chi-square statistic ($\chi^2 (5) = 4.64, p = 0.46$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = 0.0; SRMR = 0.03). Results are presented in Tables 11 and 12. Supporting Hypothesis 3a, I found that the mega-threat had important downstream consequences for Black employees leading them to have significantly lower levels of task engagement after the events. The total effect of race on task engagement at Time 2 through anticipatory threat at Time 2 and identity labor at Time 2 was significant (total effect = -0.14, SE = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.28, -0.04]). In addition, I also found support for Hypothesis 3b, such that the total effect of race on social engagement at Time 2 through anticipatory threat at Time 2 and identity labor at Time 2 was significant (total effect = -0.16, SE = 0.08, 95% C.I. [-0.36, -0.04], see Figure 11).
Finally, to test my hypothesis about the moderating effect of close work relationships on the relationship between anticipatory threat and identity labor I added close work relationships as a moderator in the structural model that I ran above. Results are presented in Table 13. Close work relationships did not significantly moderate the effect of anticipatory threat on identity labor at Time 2 ($b = -0.05$, $p = .38$). Similar to subsample A, there was not a significant relationship between close work relationships and anticipatory threat at Time 2 ($r = -0.12$, $p = 0.13$) or identity labor at Time 2 ($r = -.09$, $p = 0.23$) for subsample B. Thus, I did not find evidence to support Hypothesis 4.

Taken together, the results from both samples within Study 4 demonstrate that mega-threats have a causal influence on employees that share identity group membership with victims of the event, leading these employees to engage in higher levels of identity labor which ultimately reduces their task and social engagement in the workplace.
CHAPTER 6: GENERAL DISCUSSION

This dissertation extends research on mega-threats by explicating the psychological processes triggered by mega-threats and explaining the consequences of these events for individuals at work. Drawing on research on mega-threats (Leigh & Melwani, 2019) and attributions to discrimination (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002) I argued and found evidence across four studies that mega-threats leads individuals that share social identities with victim(s) of the event to experience anticipatory threat. Furthermore, integrating research on identity suppression (Petriglieri, 2011) and emotional labor (Grandey, 2000) I argued and found empirical evidence that this experience of anticipatory threat spills over into the workplace leading social group members to engage in a process of emotional and cognitive suppression that I call identity labor. Across two studies I developed and validated a measure of identity labor, and in a third study I found causal evidence that identity labor is the mechanism through which mega-threats spill over into the workplace. Finally, I also found empirical support for my prediction that mega-threats have important organizational consequences, leading employees grappling with the occurrence of a mega-threat to have lower levels of task and social engagement through the mechanisms of anticipatory threat and identity labor. While I predicted that close work relationships would provide a buffer to the negative effects of mega-threats, I did not find empirical support for this claim. Each of these findings has important implications for theory and practice which I discuss in detail below.
Theoretical Contributions

By developing a theoretical framework that explains the influence of mega-threats on individuals at work this dissertation contributes to the literature in three important ways. First, it extends current theorizing about mega-threats by clarifying the psychological processes that occur as a result of a mega-threat. Drawing on research that has demonstrated that identity attributions are an integral aspect of an individual’s determination that they have been discriminated against (Major, Quinton, et al., 2002; McCoy & Major, 2003), I proposed that individuals must make two identity related attributions for a negative large scale societal event to be considered a mega-threat. First, observers must make a causal attribution that this event occurred because the victim(s) is a member of a particular devalued identity group. And second, observers must make the attribution that the actor holds an inherent bias against all individuals who belong to this identity group. Further, my theory suggests that these events are important occurrences for any individual that shares social identities with victim(s) harmed in mega-threats because these events serve to make salient the pervasive risk of discrimination and harm that accompanies identity group membership, leading multitudes of individuals that are members of the identity group to experience anticipatory threat.

By explicating the psychological process through which individuals come to perceive a large societal event as discriminatory, I extend theorizing on attributions to discrimination which has primarily focused on individual level personal occurrences. My theory demonstrates that when individuals come to perceive a societal event as discriminatory and they are a member of the group that was discriminated against it increases the salience of identity group stigma, and ultimately triggers individuals to experience threat, even when these occurrences happen to distant others. Thus, this research extends individual level
research on identity attributions, discrimination, and stigma to the group level by demonstrating the important influence that social group membership has on our interpretation and the subsequent psychological consequences of large-scale societal events.

Second, this dissertation advances theory on diversity and authenticity in the workplace by developing the construct of identity labor to describe the simultaneous process of identity and emotional suppression in the workplace. Prior work has demonstrated the negative consequences of emotional labor and identity suppression, namely burnout, absenteeism, and turnover (Grandey, 2000; Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011; Petriglieri, 2011). However, these streams of research have largely developed separately. Yet, in a recent review of the literature on authenticity in organizations scholars posited that identity suppression and emotional labor should be considered forms of inauthenticity in organizations, and that research should investigate both cognitive and emotional inauthenticity simultaneously to better understand authenticity in the workplace (Cha et al., 2019).

By examining the antecedents and consequences of identity labor this dissertation answers the call for research that investigates both cognitive and emotional inauthenticity at work. My theory suggests that identity suppression and emotional suppression can be thought of as complementary psychological processes where individuals devote psychological resources to suppress their authentic cognitions and emotions related to their social identities. Thus, identity labor contributes to the literature by explicating the process through which authentic cognitions and emotions are suppressed simultaneously.

I also suggest that identity labor is unique from other more general forms of inauthenticity in the workplace because identity labor occurs as a result of the tension
between experiencing identity based threat and organizational norms that prevent individuals from sharing this experience of threat with work colleagues. Research on identity management typically focuses on overall evaluations of the acceptability of revealing aspects of your identity or your true self in workplace (e.g. Roberts, Cha, Hewlin, & Settles, 2009). In contrast, I propose that engagement in identity labor stems from the specific evaluation that discussions of negative identity related cognitions and emotions will lead to negative consequences in the workplace. Although an individual may feel as if they can be authentic with their coworkers in other ways, such as integrating positive aspects of their cultural heritage into their professional behaviors (Roberts, 2005), they still may not feel as if they can reveal or discuss negative aspects of their social identities within their workplace interactions. By explicating the dynamic process through which individuals suppress specific aspects of their social identities in response to mega-threats this research advances theories of identity management and authenticity which have traditionally taken a stagnant approach to explaining these phenomena.

Third, and finally, this research contributes to research on work engagement in two ways. First, this dissertation contributes to research on work engagement by demonstrating the important influence that an event which occurs outside the bounds of organizations can have on reducing work engagement enacted within the bounds of organizations. There is a large body of research that has examined antecedents to changes in work engagement (see Christian et al., 2011 for review), however this research typically investigates changes within the work context, such as job characteristics or leadership, as antecedents to changes in work engagement. This dissertation contributes to this work by demonstrating the significant influence that events that occur within society can have on work engagement. Second, and
relatedly, this dissertation advances research on work engagement by demonstrating the significant influence that group level occurrences can have on individual level behavior in organizations. I theorize that mega-threats are important occurrences because these events impact myriads of people that identify with a particular social identity group. Mega-threats are a unique antecedent to changes in work engagement because these events can systematically change the behaviors of multitudes of individuals working within various of professions and organizations. Thus, this dissertation advances research on work engagement by explicating the cross-level effects of mega-threats on social identity group member’s work engagement.

**Limitations/Future Directions**

Future research is needed to better understand the influence of mega-threats on individuals and organizations. There are a variety of features of mega-threats, including their duration, severity, and the amount of attention that they garner, that may change the influence that these events have on individuals. Future work is needed to better understand how the features of mega-threats influence both the interpretation and psychological consequences of these occurrences. In my empirical studies I found that on average about 75% of the participants in my studies had previously heard of the events that my studies centered upon. This difference in awareness of mega-threats may arise from a variety of sources such as differences in media coverage, media consumption, and/or the social networks of event observers. Further research is needed to better understand whether these differences leads to divergent levels of awareness about mega-threats among identity group members, which may ultimately influence the effects that these events have on individuals.
Furthermore, future work is needed to further understand the potential impact that mega-threats have on other work behaviors and work relationships. For example, I proposed that there would be differences in the influence of mega-threats on work engagement for individuals with close work relationships because these relationships would lead individuals to feel more comfortable disclosing their authentic reactions to mega-threats with their relationship partners. However, I did not find empirical evidence that individuals with closer work relationships engaged in less identity labor following a mega-threat. One limitation of this dissertation is that I did not collect data about relationship dyads or the actual conversations that individuals might have been having about mega-threats in the workplace. While I argue that mega-threats are inherently a taboo topic in organizations, there is evidence that suggests that some individuals are starting to go against organizational norms regarding taboo topics and are beginning to discuss these topics with their work colleagues (American Psychological Association, 2016). Future research should employ qualitative and quantitative methods and utilize a sample of individuals working within a common organization to better understand the potential buffering effect that work relationships have on the influence of mega-threats on work behaviors.

Additionally, more research is needed to further develop the nomological network of the construct of identity labor. I argued and found evidence to support the claim that individuals engage in identity labor as a response to experiencing threat as a result of a mega-threat. However, I also found evidence in my longitudinal study at Time 1 that in general individuals were engaging in identity labor, or the suppression of authentic cognitions and emotions in the workplace, before a specific large-scale event had occurred. The pattern of results for this study suggested that there were not initial differences in identity labor
between individuals within different identity group, instead differences between groups only surfaced in response to a mega-threat. Thus, future work should investigate more general forms of identity labor in the workplace, and whether there are systematic differences in identity labor that are driven by other causes, such as explicit or implicit organizational norms regarding identity integration in the workplace.

Finally, although I tried to counterbalance the strengths and weaknesses of each study with other studies, I recognize that each of my studies has imperfections. For example, the limitation of using scenario studies to assess experiences of anticipatory threat as a result of a mega-threat in Studies 1 and 2 was addressed by measuring experiences of anticipatory threat after an event actually occurred in the real world in Studies 3 and 4. I also attempted to address issues of causality in Study 3 where individuals were surveyed at one time point after a mega-threat by conducting a longitudinal study in Study 4 that surveyed individuals at multiple times points. However, a limitation of both Study 3 and 4 is that I use self-report measures for assessing changes in behavior. Future work should observe behavioral changes or employ behavioral measures to further understand the influence that mega-threats have on work behaviors.

**Practical Implications**

Because mega-threats occur outside the bounds of organizations, managers may frequently overlook or ignore the influence that these events have on their employees (Leigh & Melwani, 2019). However, this paper suggests that mega-threats are important occurrences that managers should attend to because these events can lead to important cognitive, emotional, and behavioral changes in the workplace.
One important implication of my theory is that while there are numerous societal events managers could potentially attend to, mega-threats have important characteristics that differentiate them from other types of societal occurrences. Importantly, my theory highlights that in order to predict whether an individual will experience anticipatory threat in response to a mega-threat it is important to know whether an event observer shares social identity group membership with victims of the event. While surface level characteristics such as race or gender may be easily discernable (Harrison et al., 2002), other social identities like immigration status may be harder for managers to recognize. If organizations seek to reduce the negative effects of mega-threats, it is particularly important for managers to develop the capacity to predict when their followers may be coping with the negative psychological effects of mega-threats. One promising avenue through which managers may develop the capacity to predict the negative influence of mega-threats on their followers is through building closer relationships with their followers that encourage the integration of social identities into the workplace (Dumas et al., 2013).

A second practical implication of my theory is that while employees may generally feel as if they can be their authentic selves at work, mega-threats can act as a shock that triggers a period of increased inauthenticity in the workplace. My theory suggests that identity labor is a form of inauthenticity that occurs as a result of organizational norms which prevent individuals from sharing their identity based threat in the workplace. While many organizations have begun to encourage individuals to bring their whole selves to work (Cha et al., 2019), there are still explicit and implicit norms that prevent the discussion of taboo topics in the workplace. For example, while organizations may encourage individuals to integrate aspects of their personal lives into their organizational lives, they may also
discourage their employees from discussing topics such as race, politics, or religion at work. Deriving from my theory, managers may be able to prevent the negative effects of mega-threats from spilling over into their organizations if organizational norms are updated to encourage open discussion about difficult topics in the workplace. By fostering an environment where employees are supported and encouraged to share both positive and negative aspects of social group membership, managers may reduce the need for employees to engage in identity labor after a mega-threat; effectively reducing the negative effects that these events have on cognitions, emotions, and behaviors at work.

**Conclusion**

In sum, this dissertation advances our understanding of the often overlooked impact that societal occurrences have on individuals at work. I extend research on mega-threats by clarifying the psychological consequences of these events. I also explicate the spillover effects of mega-threats on identity group members in organizations by demonstrating the impact that the psychological experience of mega-threats has on cognitions, emotions, and behaviors in the workplace. In doing so, I join a growing body of literature that has demonstrated the utility of looking outside of organizations to explain and predict changes within organizations.
### Table 1. Study 2 Identity Labor Scale Exploratory Factor Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>Cognitive Labor Factor</th>
<th>Emotional Labor Factor</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>Item SD</th>
<th>Alpha if Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resist expressing my true thoughts with my work colleagues</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend I don't have strong opinions</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide my real thoughts from others</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mask my negative thoughts</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid discussing my true thoughts</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide my thoughts from my coworkers</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer clear of discussing the event with my coworkers</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist expressing my true emotions with my work colleagues</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend I have emotions I don't have</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide my true feelings from others</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mask my negative emotions</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid displaying my true emotions</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide how I feel from my coworkers</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put on a &quot;show&quot; or &quot;performance&quot; when interacting with my coworkers</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Eigen Values</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Explained Variance</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 197; Responses ranged from 1="not at all" to 7="A great deal"; α = 0.92
### Table 2. Study 2 Moderated Mediation Regression Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipatory Threat</td>
<td>Identity Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Condition</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Race</td>
<td>1.23***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition X Race</td>
<td>1.57**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* † p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 197 observations. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported. Coefficients based on 1,000 bootstrap samples.
Table 3. Study 3 Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Immigration status (1 = 1st/2nd gen)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anticipatory Threat</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity Labor</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Task Engagement</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Engagement</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .10, *p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cognitive Labor Factor</th>
<th>Emotional Labor Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resist expressing my true thoughts with my work colleagues</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend I don't have strong opinions</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide my real thoughts from others</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mask my negative thoughts</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid discussing my true thoughts</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide my thoughts from my coworkers</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer clear of discussing the event with my coworkers</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist expressing my true emotions with my work colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend I have emotions I don't have</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide my true feelings from others</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mask my negative emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid displaying my true emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide how I feel from my coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put on a &quot;show&quot; or &quot;performance&quot; when interacting with my coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Study 3 Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipatory Threat</td>
<td>Identity Labor</td>
<td>Task Engagement</td>
<td>Social Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R^2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td>1.46***</td>
<td>-0.39*</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Labor</td>
<td>-0.08†</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 365 observations. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported. Coefficients based on 1,000 bootstrap samples.
Table 6. Study 3 Indirect Effect Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indirect Effect: Identity Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Effect: Task Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat --&gt; Identity Labor</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Effect: Social Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat --&gt; Identity Labor</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 365 observations. Coefficients based on 1,000 bootstrap samples. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported. C.I. = 95% confidence interval computed using bias corrected percentile method; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
### Table 7. Study 4 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status (1 = U.S. Immigrant)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Labor</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Engagement</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement T2</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Engagement T2</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T3</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Labor T3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement T3</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Engagement T3</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Close Work Relationships</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample B</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Race (1 = Black)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Labor T1</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement T1</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Engagement T1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>-.14†</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement T2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-.14†</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Engagement T2</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Close Work Relationships</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: † p < .10, *p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Table 8. Study 4 Sample A Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indirect Effect: Identity Labor T2 Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Effect: Task Engagement T3 Anticipatory Threat T2 --&gt; Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Effect: Social Engagement T3 Anticipatory Threat T2 --&gt; Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 96 observations. Coefficients based on 1,000 bootstrap samples. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported. T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3. C.I. = 95% confidence interval computed using bias corrected percentile method; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
Table 9. Study 4 Sample A Indirect Effect Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indirect Effect: Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Effect: Task Engagement T3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2 --&gt; Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Effect: Social Engagement T3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2 --&gt; Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 96 observations. Coefficients based on 1,000 bootstrap samples. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported. T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3. C.I. = 95% confidence interval computed using bias corrected percentile method; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10. Study 4 Sample A Close Work Relationships Moderator Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identity Labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Work Relationships</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2 x Relationships</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 96 observations.
Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
Table 11. Study 4 Sample B Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipatory</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat T2</td>
<td>Labor T2</td>
<td>Engagement T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Labor T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 167 observations. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported. Coefficients based on 1,000 bootstrap samples. T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3.
Table 12. Study 4 Sample B Indirect Effect Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indirect Effect: Identity Labor T2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Total Effect: Task Engagement T2        | -0.14           | -0.28| -0.04|
| Anticipatory Threat T2 --> Identity Labor T2 |             |     |     |

| 3. Total Effect: Social Engagement T2      | -0.16           | -0.36| -0.04|
| Anticipatory Threat T2 --> Identity Labor T2 |             |     |     |

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 167 observations. Coefficients based on 1,000 bootstrap samples. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported. T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3. C.I. = 95% confidence interval computed using bias corrected percentile method; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.
Table 13. Study 4 Sample B Close Work Relationships Moderator Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identity Labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Work Relationships</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2 x Relationships</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\dagger p < .10; \ast p < .05; \ast\ast p < .01; \ast\ast\ast p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 167 observations.

Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
Figure 1. Theoretical Model
Figure 2. Study 1 Mean Anticipatory Threat
Figure 3. Study 2 Mean Anticipatory Threat

Race and Condition

- Black Participants Mega-Threat: 5.25
- White Participants Mega-Threat: 2.46
- Black Participants Control: 3.62
- White Participants Control: 2.39
Figure 4. Study 2 Mean Identity Labor

![Bar chart showing mean identity labor for different conditions and races.](chart.png)
Figure 5. Study 2 Moderated Mediation Results

Black vs. White
(0=White, 1=Black)

Condition
(0=Control, 1=Race Based)

1.57**

Anticipatory Threat

0.07

Identity Labor

0.32***

Moderated Mediation Effects

Index of moderated mediation: 0.47, SE = 0.17, 95% C.I. [0.15, 0.84]

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

1,000 bootstraps, reporting bias corrected coefficient estimates
Figure 6. Study 3 Identity Labor Mediation Results

Indirect Effect: 0.46, $SE = 0.10$, 95% C.I. [0.30, 0.69]

Note: † p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
1,000 bootstraps, reporting bias corrected co-efficient estimates
Figure 7. Study 3 Total Effect of Mega-threats on Task & Social Engagement

Total Effects for Task and Social Engagement

Task Engagement Total Effect: -0.03, \(SE = 0.02\), 90\% C.I. [-0.09, -0.06]
Social Engagement Total Effect: -0.10, \(SE = 0.03\), 95\% C.I. [-0.18, -0.05]

*Note:* † \(p < .10\), *\(p < .05\), **\(p < .01\), ***\(p < .001\)
1,000 bootstraps, reporting bias corrected co-efficient estimates
Indirect Effect: 0.28, SE = 0.14, 95% C.I. [0.06, 0.62]

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
1,000 bootstraps, reporting bias corrected co-efficient estimates
Figure 9. Study 4 Subsample A Total Effect of Mega-Threats

Total Effects for Task and Social Engagement
- Task Engagement Total Effect: -0.05, SE = 0.04, 95% C.I. [-0.17, -0.004]
- Social Engagement Total Effect: -0.02, SE = 0.04, 95% C.I. [-0.12, 0.04]

Note: † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
1,000 bootstraps, reporting bias corrected co-efficient estimates
Figure 10. Study 4 Subsample B Identity Labor Mediation Results

Indirect Effect: 0.80, \( SE = 0.17 \), 95\% C.I. [0.51, 1.15]

Note: \( \dagger \) p < .10, \( \ast \) p < .05, \( \ast \ast \) p < .01, \( \ast \ast \ast \) p < .001

1,000 bootstraps, reporting bias corrected co-efficient estimates
**Figure 11. Study 4 Subsample B Total Effect of Mega-Threats**

**Total Effects for Task and Social Engagement**
- Task Engagement Total Effect: -0.14, SE = 0.06, 95% C.I. [-0.28, -0.04]
- Social Engagement Total Effect: -0.16, SE = 0.08, 95% C.I. [-0.36, -0.04]

*Note:* † p < .10, *p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
1,000 bootstraps, reporting bias corrected co-efficient estimates
APPENDIX A. SURVEY FOR SURVEY 1

Study Instructions: The purpose of this study is to better understand the influence of events on people. In this survey you will be presented with an article about a real event.

After reading the article you will then answer multiple survey items that are meant to assess your reaction to the event. You will be asked questions about the event so make sure you read the article in its entirety.

You will also be asked questions about your gender. Please be sure to answer each question honestly. Before we begin you will first be asked a few demographic background questions.

Once you have read and understand these instructions, please click next (the arrow below) to continue.

Demographics Items

- What is your age?
- What gender do you identify with?
  - Male
  - Female
- What is your race/ethnicity?
  - White
  - Black/African-American
  - East Asian
  - South Asian
  - American Indian
  - Pacific Islander
- Are you of Hispanic origin?
  - Yes
  - No
- If you are a student at UNC, what year are you?
  - First Year Undergraduate
  - Second Year Undergraduate
  - Third Year Undergraduate
  - Fourth Year Undergraduate
  - Fifth Year Undergraduate
  - Graduate Student
  - N/A – not a UNC student

News articles for conditions

Participants were presented with one of two articles.
Instructions presented to participants: Imagine you are reading the news and you come across the article below. Please read the full article. Once you are done reading click the arrow to move onto the next questions.

Article for Mega-threat condition

Today, the Senate announced that they are going to call the CEO of one of the largest tech firms in the U.S. to testify in front of a senate committee. This CEO was recently voted as one of the most powerful leaders in the world, and is renowned for his innovation, risk-taking and tough decision-making skills.

This is in response to the exposé published in the Washington Post last week that alleges that the CEO harassed a 22-year old female employee who asked to remain anonymous.

In an exclusive interview with the Post, the victim said that after graduating from college six months ago, working for the firm was a dream come true. However, her dream quickly turned into a nightmare. She vividly recalled the CEO welcoming her into his office and once inside he pressed a hidden button on his desk that locked the door. He then began making crude jokes and physically advancing toward her. She was quoted saying “I felt unsafe, my heart was racing, and I started to panic.” She made numerous attempts to politely decline his advances. Finally, after several minutes she escaped his office. She was visibly shaken and immediately told her boss about the incident.

Further investigations into this incident, and others like it at the firm, are still ongoing. Tech Times will continue to provide updates on this story as they develop.
Article for Control Condition

Study Scales

All items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree

**Anticipatory threat** (Onraet et al., 2013; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013):

“While Reading the article I …”

- Worried this could happen to me
- Worried that my gender makes me vulnerable to experiencing a situation like this
- Was concerned I could end up in a situation like this because of my gender

**Gender Salience** (Steele et al., 2002):

“While reading the article I …”

- Thought about my gender
Identity Centrality (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992):

For each item, indicate how much you agree or disagree with what the item says.

- Overall, my gender has little to do with how I feel about myself
- My gender is an important reflection of who I am
- In general, belonging to my gender group is an important part of my self-image
APPENDIX B. SURVEY FOR STUDY 2

Study Instructions Presented to Participants: Welcome to the study! The purpose of this study is to better understand the influence of events on people at work. You MUST BE EMPLOYED FULL-TIME OUTSIDE OF MTURK TO QUALIFY FOR THIS SURVEY.

In this survey you will be presented with an article about a real event. After reading the article you will then answer multiple survey items that are meant to assess your reaction to the event. You will be asked questions about the event so make sure you read the article in its entirety.

You will also be asked questions about your racial group. Please be sure to answer each question honestly. Before we begin you will first be asked a few demographic background questions.

Once you have read and understand these instructions, please click next (the arrow below) to continue.

Demographics Items

- What is your age?
- What is the highest level of education you have completed?
  - High school or equivalent
  - Some college, but no degree
  - Associate degree
  - Bachelor’s degree
  - Master’s Degree
  - Professional School Degree (MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
  - Doctorate Degree (PhD, EdD)
  - Other
- What gender do you identify with?
  - Male
  - Female
  - Self-report (please enter text with your gender identity)
- What is your race/ethnicity?
  - White/Caucasian
  - Black/African-American
- Are you of Hispanic origin?
  - Yes
  - No

Identity Centrality (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992):

For each item, indicate how much you agree or disagree with what the item says.

- Overall, my race has little to do with how I feel about myself
• My race is an important reflection of who I am
• In general, belonging to my racial group is an important part of my self-image

News articles for conditions

Participants were presented with one of two articles.

Instructions presented to participants: Imagine you are reading the news and you come across the article below. Please read the full article. Once you are done reading click the arrow to move onto the next questions.

Mega-Threat Condition Article

![Image of THE GLOBE newspaper]

**DEADLY INCIDENT IN GREENVILLE**

Tensions continue to grow in the wake of the **shooting death of an unarmed Black man** by Greenville police Sunday night.

The shooting occurred in the backyard of the victim, Jamal Jackson’s, home. Police arrived in Jackson’s neighborhood in response to a 911 caller that reported that an armed man had broken into someone’s home and was now in another resident’s backyard.

Police encountered Jackson in his backyard and ordered him to “Stop” and show his hands. When Jackson showed his hands officers yelled “Gun!” and began shooting. It turns out, Jackson only had a cellphone in his hands. A total of 20 shots were fired, 4 hit Jackson directly killing him at the scene.

Further investigations into this incident are still on-going. The Globe will continue to provide updates on this story as they develop.

Article for control condition
Study Scales

**Anticipatory threat** (Onraet et al., 2013; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013):

Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree

“While Reading the article I …”

- Worried this could happen to me
- Worried that my race makes me vulnerable to experiencing a situation like this
- Was concerned I could end up in a situation like this because of my race

**Attributions to Discrimination** (McCoy & Major, 2003):

Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree

“While reading the article I thought that …”

- Race was an important part of the event
- Racism was a contributing factor to the event
- Race had very little to do with the event

**Identity Labor Scale** (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003):

Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = A great deal

Imagine that you read this article at work. After reading this article at work I would have to ...
• Resist expressing my true emotions with my work colleagues
• Hide my true feelings from others
• Mask my negative emotions
• Avoid displaying my true emotions
• Hide how I feel from my coworkers
• Put on a "show" or "performance" when interacting with my coworkers
• Pretend I have emotions I don't have
• Resist expressing my true thoughts with my work colleagues
• Hide my real thoughts from others
• Mask my negative thoughts
• Avoid discussing my true thoughts
• Hide my thoughts from my coworkers
• Steer clear of discussing the event with my coworkers
• Pretend I don't have strong opinions
APPENDIX C. SURVEY FOR STUDY 3

Study instructions presented to participants: Welcome to this study!

On this past Sunday, July 14, 2019 the U.S. President posted numerous tweets with disparaging remarks about 4 U.S. Congresswomen. Since this event there have been numerous reports about the U.S. President's remarks. In this survey we are interested in how this event has impacted you (if at all). And whether you have discussed this event at work.

Please click the arrow below to continue with the survey.

Study instructions presented to participants: Below are excerpts from two news articles describing this event. Please read this and then answer the question and continue with the survey.

*Trump Tells Congresswomen to ‘Go Back’ to the Countries They Came From*

THE NEW YORK TIMES — President Trump said on Sunday that a group of four minority congresswomen feuding with Speaker Nancy Pelosi should “go back” to the countries they came from rather than “loudly and viciously telling the people of the United States” how to run the government.

Wrapped inside that insult, which was widely established as a racist trope, was a factually inaccurate claim: Only one of the lawmakers was born outside the country.

*Trump Attacks Congresswomen at N.C. Rally, As Crowd Chants ‘Send Her Back’*

NPR — President Trump continued his attacks against four freshman Democratic congresswomen at a campaign rally in Greenville, N.C., on Wednesday, with the crowd breaking into a chant of “send her back” against one, echoing the president’s racist message from the weekend.
Study Scales

Heard about the event - Have you heard about this event before reading this article?

Anticipatory threat (Onraet et al., 2013; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013):
Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree
Over the past few days since this event I’ve …
  • Worried about my personal safety
  • Worried that someone may treat me differently because of my immigration status
  • Been concerned that I could become the target of discrimination

Identity Labor Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003):
Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = A great deal
Over the last few days at work I’ve had to …
  • Resist expressing my true emotions with my work colleagues
  • Hide my true feelings from others
  • Mask my negative emotions
  • Avoid displaying my true emotions
  • Hide how I feel from my coworkers
  • Put on a "show" or "performance" when interacting with my coworkers
  • Pretend I have emotions I don't have
  • Resist expressing my true thoughts with my work colleagues
  • Hide my real thoughts from others
  • Mask my negative thoughts
  • Avoid discussing my true thoughts
  • Hide my thoughts from my coworkers
  • Steer clear of discussing the event with my coworkers
  • Pretend I don't have strong opinions

Task Engagement Scale (Barnes et al., 2015):
Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree
Over the past few days at work I’ve …
  • Worked with intensity at my job
  • Felt interested in my job
  • Devoted a lot of attention to my job

Social Engagement scale (Soane et al., 2012):
Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree
Over the past few days at work I’ve …

- Sought out connections with my work colleagues
- Enjoyed spending time with my coworkers
- Sought out opportunities to work on tasks with others

**Close Work Relationships** - Strength of friendships scale (Sias & Cahill, 1998):

Measured on a 5-point Liker scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about your friendships or relationships at work.

- I have formed strong friendships at work
- I socialize with co-workers outside of the workplace
- I can confide in people at work
- I feel that I can trust my co-workers a great deal
- Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job
- I do not feel like anyone I work with is a true friend

**Workforce Diversity**

Measured on a scale from 0 to 100 percent.

- Estimate the percentage of your job's workforce that are racial/ethnic minorities.

**Climate for Inclusion** (Nishii, 2013):

Measured on a 5-point Liker scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

In thinking about your workplace how much do you think your workplace …

- Is characterized by a non-threatening environment in which people can reveal their “true” selves.
- Commits resources to ensuring that employees are able to resolve conflicts effectively
- Employees in your workplace are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs that they fill
- Has a culture in which employees appreciate the differences that people bring to the workplace

**CFA Scales**

_Study instructions presented to participants:_ Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. That is the extent to which the items generally reflect your typical experiences at work.

All items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree
**Authenticity** (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014):

- At work, I always stand by what I believe in
- I am true to myself in most situations at work
- I behave in accordance with my values and beliefs in the workplace
- At work, I feel the need to do what others expect me to do
- I am strongly influence in the workplace by the opinions of others

**Identity Suppression** (Madera et al., 2012):

- I refrain from talking about my identity with my coworkers.
- I try not to talk about this identity with my supervisor.
- No one I work with knows how important this identity is to me.
- I suppress this identity at work.

**Facades of Conformity** (Hewlin, 2009)

- I don’t share things about myself in order to fit in at work
- I suppress personal values that are different from those of the organization
- I withhold personal values that conflict with organizational values
- I don’t “play politics” by pretending to embrace organizational values
- I behave in a manner that reflects the organization’s system, even though it is inconsistent with my personal values
- I say things that I don’t really believe at work

**Job satisfaction** (Wanous et al., 1997)

- Overall, I am satisfied with my job

**Turnover Intentions** (Tepper et al., 2009)

- I plan on leaving my job very soon
- I expect to change jobs in the next few months
- I will look to change jobs soon

**Organizational Commitment** (Tepper et al., 2004)

- I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with my organization
- I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization
- This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me
APPENDIX D. SURVEY FOR STUDY 4

Time 1 Survey

Study instructions presented to participants: Welcome to this study! This is a three part study where you will answer questions about your demographics, thoughts, and work behaviors at three different time points.

This survey will take about 15 minutes and you will be paid $1.50 for your participation. You will be again to take similar surveys and you will be paid additional money to complete these surveys.

To qualify for this 3-part study you must be employed part/full time outside of Amazon mturk.

If you meet this criteria please click next to begin.

Study instructions presented to participants: In this survey you will be asked several survey questions meant to capture demographic information and information about your work behaviors and relationships. It is important that you answer all of these questions and you answer them honestly!

When you are ready please click next to begin.

Demographics Items and Scales

- What is your age?
- What is the highest level of education you have completed?
  - High school or equivalent
  - Some college, but no degree
  - Associate degree
  - Bachelor’s degree
  - Master’s Degree
  - Professional School Degree (MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
  - Doctorate Degree (PhD, EdD)
  - Other
- What country were you born in?
  - If participants indicated they were born outside of the U.S.
    - How many years have you been in the U.S.?
- What gender do you identify with?
  - Male
  - Female
  - Self-report (please enter text with your gender identity)
- What is your race/ethnicity?
  - White/Caucasian
  - Black/African-American


- East Asian
- South Asian
- American Indian
- Pacific Islander

- Are you of Hispanic origin?
  - Yes
  - No

Study instructions presented to participants: Now you will answer several questions about your workplace and experiences at work.

Identity Labor Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003):
Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = A great deal
In the last week at work I feel as if I had to …

- Resist expressing my true emotions with my work colleagues
- Hide my true feelings from others
- Mask my negative emotions
- Avoid displaying my true emotions
- Hide how I feel from my coworkers
- Put on a "show" or "performance" when interacting with my coworkers
- Pretend I have emotions I don't have
- Resist expressing my true thoughts with my work colleagues
- Hide my real thoughts from others
- Mask my negative thoughts
- Avoid discussing my true thoughts
- Hide my thoughts from my coworkers
- Steer clear of discussing the event with my coworkers
- Pretend I don't have strong opinions

Task Engagement Scale (Barnes et al., 2015):
Measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = Never to 5 = Always
Please indicate in general, that is on average, at work you typically …

- Work with intensity at my job
- Feel interested in my job
- Devote a lot of attention to my job

Social Engagement scale (Soane et al., 2012):
Measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = Never to 5 = Always
Please indicate in general, that is on average, at work you typically …
• Seek out connections with my work colleagues
• Enjoy spending time with my coworkers
• Seek out opportunities to work on tasks with others

**Strength of friendships scale** (Sias & Cahill, 1998):

Measured on a 5-point Liker scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about your friendships or relationships at work.

• I have formed strong friendships at work
• I socialize with co-workers outside of the workplace
• I can confide in people at work
• I feel that I can trust my co-workers a great deal
• Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job
• I do not feel like anyone I work with is a true friend

**Workforce Diversity**

Measured on a scale from 0 to 100 percent.

• Estimate the percentage of your job's workforce that are racial/ethnic minorities.

**Climate for Inclusion** (Nishii, 2013):

Measured on a 5-point Liker scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

In thinking about your workplace how much do you think your workplace …

• Is characterized by a non-threatening environment in which people can reveal their “true” selves.
• Commits resources to ensuring that employees are able to resolve conflicts effectively
• Employees in your workplace are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs that they fill
• Has a culture in which employees appreciate the differences that people bring to the workplace

**Time 2 Survey**

*Study instructions presented to participants at Time 2 subsample A*

Welcome to part 2 of this study!

Over the last few days there have been a number of events that have occurred related to immigration in the U.S. In this survey we are interested in how these events have impacted you (if at all). And whether they have impacted your motivation at work.
Your responses will be kept confidential and we appreciate your honest responses to advance our research.

Below are excerpts from news articles describing these events. Please read this and then answer the question and continue with the survey.

*Time 2 News article – Subsample A*

**Doctor compares conditions for unaccompanied children at immigrant holding centers to ‘torture facilities’**

MCALLEN, Texas – Last week began with a broad political discussion on whether Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s designation of migrant detention centers as “concentration camps” was the correct nomenclature for holding rooms in which 41 detainees live in a cell built for eight. The week ended with heinous reports of the conditions at said camps, where undocumented migrant children are being held away from their families in conditions “worse than jail,” according to physician Dolly Lucio Siver, who wrote up a medical declaration obtained by ABC News.

The alleged conditions documented at the facilities follow a Homeland Security inspector general report that found “dangerous overcrowding” and unsanitary conditions at a different CBP facility in El Paso, Texas, where hundreds more migrants were being housed than the center was designed to hold. The El Paso Del Norte Processing Center housed as many as 900 migrant detainees earlier this month despite only having a recommended capacity for 125.

*Study instructions presented to participants at Time 3 subsample A*

Welcome to part 3 of this study!
Over the past week there have been two highly publicized stories about shootings of Black Americans in their homes by Police officers. In this study we are interested in understanding how these events have impacted you (if at all) at work.

Your responses will be kept confidential and we appreciate your honest responses to advance our research.

Below are excerpts from news articles describing these events. Please read this and then answer the question and continue with the survey.

*Time 3 News article – Subsample A*

**Trump Tells Congresswomen to ‘Go Back’ to the Countries They Came From**

Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump · Jul 14)

So interesting to see “Progressive” Democrat Congresswomen, who originally came from countries whose governments are a complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere in the world (if they even have a functioning government at all), now loudy....
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Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump · Jul 14)

…and viciously telling the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth, how our government is to be run. Why don’t they go back and help fix the totally broken and crime infested places from which they came. Then come back and show us how...
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THE NEW YORK TIMES -- President Trump said on Sunday that a group of four minority congresswomen feuding with Speaker Nancy Pelosi should “go back” to the countries they came from rather than “loudly and viciously telling the people of the United States” how to run the government.

Wrapped inside that insult, which was widely established as a racist trope, was a factually inaccurate claim: Only one of the lawmakers was born outside the country.

**Trump Attacks Congresswomen At N.C. Rally, As Crowd Chants ‘Send Her Back’**

NPR -- President Trump continued his attacks against four freshman Democratic congresswomen at a campaign rally in Greenville, N.C., on Wednesday, with the crowd breaking into a chant of “send her back” against one, echoing the president's racist message from the weekend.
Study instructions presented to participants at Time 2 subsample B

Welcome to of this study!

Over the past week there have been two highly publicized stories about shootings of Black Americans in their homes by Police officers. In this study we are interested in understanding how these events have impacted you (if at all) at work.

Your responses will be kept confidential and we appreciate your honest responses to advance our research.

Below are excerpts from news articles describing these events. Please read this and then answer the question and continue with the survey.
**Time 2 News article – Subsample B**

Amber Guyger gets 10-year murder sentence for fatally shooting Botham Jean

By Clint C. Mclaughlin and Steve Almsay, CNN

Updated 4:26 AM ET, Thu October 3, 2019

CNN – Amber Guyger, the former Dallas police officer who killed Botham Jean in his apartment last year, is heading to prison to begin a 10-year sentence. She will first be eligible for parole in five years.

On Wednesday, a Dallas County jury sentenced Ms. Guyger, who is white, to 10 years in prison in a case that was one of the latest, and also one of the most unusual, in a series of high-profile confrontations between police officers and unarmed black men across America.

The jury deliberated for about an hour and a half before deciding upon a sentence that was well short of the maximum 99 years in prison Ms. Guyger could have received — but also longer than the two years jurors might have imposed.

Woman shot, killed by Texas police officer in her own home

Posted 10:59 PM, October 23, 2019 by CNN Wire

CNN - A woman was shot and killed by a police officer in her Fort Worth, Texas home after a neighbor called dispatchers to report the woman’s front door was open, police said.

The officers were searching the perimeter of the woman’s home when they saw a person standing near a window inside and one of them opened fire, killing her, Fort Worth police said.

The shooting is reminiscent of the death of Botham Jean, an unarmed black man who was killed in his Dallas home by a white police officer last year. In this case, Jefferson’s family wants to know how and why the 28-year-old pre-med graduate wound up dead.

**Study Scales**

Note: the same scales were presented to participants in both samples at Time 2 and Time 3.

**Heard about the event** - Have you heard about this event before reading this article?

**Anticipatory threat** (Onraet et al., 2013; Onraet & Van Hiel, 2013):

Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree

Over the past few days since this event I’ve …

- Worried about my personal safety
• Worried that someone may treat me differently because of my immigration status [race]
• Been concerned that I could become the target of discrimination

**Identity Labor Scale** (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003):

Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = A great deal

Over the last few days at work I’ve had to …

• Resist expressing my true emotions with my work colleagues
• Hide my true feelings from others
• Mask my negative emotions
• Avoid displaying my true emotions
• Hide how I feel from my coworkers
• Put on a "show" or "performance" when interacting with my coworkers
• Pretend I have emotions I don't have
• Resist expressing my true thoughts with my work colleagues
• Hide my real thoughts from others
• Mask my negative thoughts
• Avoid discussing my true thoughts
• Hide my thoughts from my coworkers
• Steer clear of discussing the event with my coworkers
• Pretend I don't have strong opinions

**Task Engagement Scale** (Barnes et al., 2015):

Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree

Over the past few days at work I’ve …

• Worked with intensity at my job
• Felt interested in my job
• Devoted a lot of attention to my job

**Social Engagement scale** (Soane et al., 2012):

Measured on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree

Over the past few days at work I’ve …

• Sought out connections with my work colleagues
• Enjoyed spending time with my coworkers
• Sought out opportunities to work on tasks with others
APPENDIX E. SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES

Study 1: Supplementary Analysis

Independent Variable: Identity Centrality. To test whether gender identification was an additional moderator to the experiences of anticipatory threat, I ran a series of regressions with gender identity centrality, condition, and gender as the independent variables. I measured gender identity centrality with a 3-item measure ($\alpha = 0.81$) adapted from Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) (See Appendix A. for items). Participants rated their endorsement of these items on a scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. In an initial regression with the interaction between condition and gender and identity centrality regressed on anticipatory threat. Results of this regression analysis are presented in Table SA.1. I found that identity centrality was a significant predictor of anticipatory threat ($b = 0.24$, $t$-value = 3.06, $p < .01$). Across both conditions individuals that have higher gender identity centrality experienced higher anticipatory threat.

| TABLE SA.1 |
| Study 1 Identity Centrality Regression Analysis |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipatory Threat</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^* p < .10; ^* * p < .05; ^* * * p < .01; ^* * * * p < .001$
Standard errors are in parentheses; $N = 183$ observations.
Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
However, I did not find evidence that identity centrality interacted with gender to predict identity centrality. First, I conducted a three-way moderated regression analysis, with condition, gender, and identity centrality as independent variables. Results of this regression analysis are presented in Table SA.2. I found that identity centrality did not interact with condition ($b = -0.003$, $t$-value $= -0.18$, $p = ns.$), gender ($b = -0.002$, $t$-value $= -0.01$, $p = ns.$), or both ($b = 0.15$, $t$-value $= 0.45$, $p = ns.$) to significantly predict anticipatory threat. Second, to get a better understanding of the influence of identity centrality on experiences of anticipatory threat within the context of a mega-threat I filtered the data just on the mega-threat condition and conducted a two-way moderated regression analysis with gender and identity centrality as the independent variables. Results of this regression analysis are presented in Table SA.3. I again found that gender was a significant predictor of anticipatory threat ($b = 2.74$, $t$-value $= 2.84$, $p < .01$), while identity centrality was marginally significant ($b = 0.21$, $t$-value $= 1.67$, $p = 0.09$), and the interaction between identity centrality and gender was not significant ($b = 0.15$, $t$-value $= 0.72$, $p = ns.$). Thus, I did not find evidence to support the notion that in the wake of a mega-threat that individuals that have higher levels of identification with their gender group experience higher levels of anticipatory threat than those lower in identification. Visualization of this analysis can be found in Figure SA.1.

**TABLE SA.2**

Study 1 Three-way Interaction Identity Centrality Regression Analysis
### TABLE SA.3

Study 1 Identity Centrality Regression Analysis (in Mega-Threat Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Anticipatory Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.51 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.22 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Gender</td>
<td>1.23 (1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.00 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.00 (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Gender x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.15 (0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; $N = 183$ observations. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Anticipatory Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.21† (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.74*** (0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.15 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; $N = 86$ observations in the mega-threat condition. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
Study 2: Supplementary Analysis

Attributions to Race by Condition and Participant Race. To better understand differences in attributions to race for mega-threats I ran a moderated regression analysis with condition, participant race, and the interaction between these two variables as the independent variables. Results are presented in Table SA.4. I found that the overall model was significant $F(3,193) = 40.50, p < .001$, and that condition was a significant predictor of attributions to race ($b = 2.56, p < .001$), while participant race ($b = 0.48, p = 0.18$) and the interaction between participant race and condition ($b = 0.78, p = 0.12$) were not significant predictors of attributions to race. Further probing this interaction, I ran a one-way ANOVA with contrast testing. This analysis revealed that within the control condition there was not
significant difference in attributions to race between Black ($M = 3.08, SD = 1.95$) and White participants ($M = 2.61, SD = 1.83, t = 1.37, p = ns.$). However, there was a significant difference within the mega-threat condition between Black and White participants, where Black participants made significantly higher attributions to race ($M = 6.12, SD = 1.15$) than White participants ($M = 4.87, SD = 1.88, t = 3.49, p < .01$). See Figure SA.2. Taken together, these results support the notion that while all event observers may make some attributions or inferences that social group membership was the cause of a large scale negative event, these attributions may be higher or stronger for event observers that are members of the harmed group. While this is outside the scope of this dissertation, future research should consider the potential interactive effect of other social identities that may increase or decrease attributions to social group membership.

**TABLE SA.4**

Study 2 Attributions to Race Manipulation Check Moderated Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Attributions to Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>2.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition X Race</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\hat{p} < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; $N = 197$ observations.

Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
Independent Variable: Identity Centrality. To test whether racial identification was an additional moderator to the experiences of anticipatory threat, I ran a series of regressions with racial identity centrality, condition, and participant race as the independent variables. I measured identity centrality using the same 3-item measure from Study 1 (α = 0.80). In an initial regression with the interaction between condition and race and racial identity centrality regressed on anticipatory threat. Results of this regression analysis are presented in Table SA.5. I found that racial identity centrality was not a significant predictor of anticipatory threat \((b = 0.02, \ t-value = 0.24, \ p = ns.)\), while participant race \((b = 1.20, \ t-value = 3.50, \ p < .001.)\), and the interaction between condition and race \((b = 1.55, \ t-value = 3.19, \ p < .01)\) were still significant predictors of anticipatory threat.
To further understand the influence of condition, race, and racial centrality on anticipatory threat I conducted two additional regression analyses. First, I conducted a three-way moderated regression analysis with participant race, condition, and racial centrality as the independent variables and anticipatory threat as the dependent variable. Results are presented in Table SA.6. I found that the three-way interaction between condition, participant race, and racial identity centrality was significant (\(b = 0.98, \text{t-value} = 2.87, p < .01\)). This three-way interaction suggests that Black participants within the mega-threat condition with higher identity centrality experienced higher levels of anticipatory threat than Black participants within this condition with lower levels of racial identity centrality. The second analysis I ran was a two-way moderated regression analysis for participants just within the mega-threat condition. Results of this analysis are presented in Table SA.7. Within the mega-threat condition, I did not find a significant interaction between race and racial identity centrality interacted (\(b = 0.37, \text{t-value} = 1.48, p = .14\)). While the data is trending in the direction that Black participants within this experienced higher levels of anticipatory threat than Black participants with lower levels of racial identity centrality the non-significant interaction term demonstrates that this difference was not significant (see Figure
Thus, I did not conclusive evidence to support the notion that in the wake of a mega-threat that identity group members with higher identity centrality experience higher levels of anticipatory threat than those with lower levels of identity centrality.

**TABLE SA. 6**

Study 2 Three-way Interaction Moderated Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Anticipatory Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>0.45 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>4.22*** (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.13 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Race</td>
<td>-3.43* (1.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>-0.09 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>-0.61* (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Race x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.98** (0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 197 observations.
Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.

**TABLE SA. 7**

Study 2 Identity Centrality Moderated Regression Analysis within the Mega-Threat Condition
### FIGURE SA.3

Study 2 Identity Centrality Plot for White and Black participants in the Mega-Threat Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Anticipatory Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.79 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.04 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Identity Centrality</td>
<td>0.37 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 96 observations in the mega-threat condition. Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
Study 3: Supplementary Analysis

*Moderators: Close Work Relationships, Workforce Diversity and Climate for Inclusion.* In my dissertation I proposed that close work relationships would moderate the relationship between anticipatory threat and identity labor because these relationships would provide individuals with the opportunity to express their authentic reactions to mega-threats. The basic premise of this argument is that there are features of the organizational context, like the relationships that an individual has, that may reduce the need for individuals to engage in identity labor when they enter the workplace. To further understand the influence of features of the organizational context on the enactment of identity labor I ran a series of moderated regression analyses with three moderator variables: close work relationships, the percent racial/ethnic diversity of an organization’s workforce, and climate for inclusion.

As described within the body of my dissertation, close work relationships are defined as relationships with work colleagues that goes beyond work tasks (Dumas et al., 2013). I measured close work relationships in Study 3 using the same 6-item scale from Study 4 ($\alpha = 0.92$; Sias & Cahill, 1998). I ran a moderated regression analysis with anticipatory threat, close work relationships, and their interaction as the independent variables, immigration status as a control variable, and identity labor as the dependent variable. Results are presented in Table SA.8. I did not find evidence that close work relationships interacted with anticipatory threat ($b = -0.01, t-value = -0.20, p = ns.$). However, I did find that the main effects of close work relationships ($b = -0.42, t-value = -3.10, p < .01$) and anticipatory threat ($b = 0.31, t-value = 2.12, p < .01$) were significant opposite predictors of identity labor. In other words, as expected higher levels of anticipatory threat led to increased identity labor, and stronger close work relationships led to lower identity labor.
Next, I ran an analysis to determine whether the percentage of racial diversity within an organization leads to lower levels of identity labor. I propose that individuals engage in identity labor in order to avoid highlighting dissimilarity from their coworkers, which can lead to negative consequences in the workplace (Dumas et al., 2013). It follows that if participants work in a more demographically diverse organization then individuals that belong to minority groups (Ragins, 1997) may have more opportunities to express their authentic event reactions with other individuals that are also members of the harmed identity group. Instead of highlighting dissimilarity, these conversations have the potential to highlight racial similarity and potentially strengthen the bonds between relationship partners. In addition, if organizations have high levels of demographic diversity, dissimilarity may be chronically salient when employees are within the organizational context. If employees are already chronically aware of their dissimilarities, then discussions of mega-threats may
become less risky. In order to investigate the potential moderating influence of organizational demographic diversity on the enactment of identity labor I asked participants to respond to a 1-item measure that asked them to indicate on a sliding scale the percent of the work force within their organization that are racial ethnic minorities. I ran a moderated regression analysis with percent workforce diversity (in whole number form, e.g. 14% = 14), anticipatory threat, and their interaction as the independent variables, immigration status as a control variable, and identity labor as the dependent variable. Results are presented in Table SA. 9. Workforce diversity did not interact with anticipatory threat to significantly predict identity labor ($b = 0.00$, $t$-value $= 0.09$, $p = ns$). Furthermore, the main effect of workforce diversity was not a significant predictor of identity labor ($b = 0.00$, $t$-value $= 0.28$, $p = ns$). Thus, I did not find any evidence that the demographic diversity of an organization’s workforce reduced the need for individuals to engage in identity labor after a mega-threat.

**TABLE SA. 9**

Study 3 Workforce Diversity Moderated Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identity Labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Workforce Diversity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat x Workforce Diversity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td>-0.37†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ = 0.09

$† p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; $N = 365$ observations.

Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
Finally, I ran an analysis to determine whether climate for inclusion impacted enactment in identity labor. Climate for inclusion is defined as the shared perception that inclusive behaviors are expected, rewarded, and supported within an organization (Nishii, 2013). When organizational climate for inclusion is high, individuals have the freedom to reveal aspects of their core selves without the fear that they will suffer negative consequences for doing so (Nishii, 2013). In the wake of a mega-threat, individuals may find it easier to discuss their authentic event reactions with their work colleagues when their organizational climate for inclusion is high, because the organizational climate reduces the potential negative effects of discussing the event. In order to investigate the potential moderating effect of organizational climate for inclusion, I asked participants to respond to a four-item measure adapted from the integration of differences dimension of Nishii’s (2013) climate for inclusion scale (α = 0.90). I ran a moderated regression analysis to assess the moderating effect of climate for inclusion. Results are presented in Table SA. 10. I found that while the main effects of climate for inclusion ($b = -0.44$, $t$-value = -2.93, $p < .01$) and anticipatory threat ($b = 0.40$, $t$-value = 1.99, $p < .05$) significantly predicted identity labor, the interaction between these two variables did not significantly predict identity labor ($b = -0.03$, $t$-value = -0.49, $p = ns.$). Thus, I did not find evidence that climate for inclusion moderated the influence of anticipatory threat on identity labor.

**TABLE SA. 10**

Study 3 Climate for Inclusion Moderated Regression Analysis
Study 4: Supplementary Analysis

**Moderators: Workforce Diversity and Climate for Inclusion.** Similar to Study 3, I ran a series of moderated regression analyses to investigate the potential moderating effect of organizational racial diversity and climate for inclusion. In this study, I used the same 1-item measure of percent workforce diversity and the same 5-item measure of climate for inclusion as I did in Study 3 (See Appendix D for items). These constructs were assessed at Time 1 in the initial study recruitment survey.

I began my analysis for Sample A, by running a moderated regression analysis to assess the moderating influence of percent workforce diversity on the enactment of identity labor. Results are presented in Table SA. 11. I found that percent workforce diversity did not interact with anticipatory threat to predict identity labor ($b = 0.00, t = -0.083, p = \text{ns.}$).

Next, I ran a moderated regression analysis to assess the moderating influence of climate for inclusion on the enactment of identity labor. Results are presented in Table SA. 12. I found that climate for inclusion did not interact with anticipatory threat to significantly predict identity labor ($b = 0.12, t = 0.1.35, p = 0.18$). However, I did find a main effect for climate...
for inclusion, such that higher levels of climate for inclusion led to significantly lower levels of identity labor ($b = -0.61, t = -2.03, p < .05$).

**TABLE SA. 11**

Study 4A: Workforce Diversity Moderated Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identity Labor T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Workforce Diversity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2 x Workforce Diversity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 96 observations.
Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.

**TABLE SA. 12**

Study 4A: Climate for Inclusion Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identity Labor T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Inclusion</td>
<td>-0.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2 x Climate for Inclusion</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 96 observations.
Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.
I also ran a similar analysis for Sample B. First, I ran a moderated regression analysis to assess the moderating influence of organizational demographic diversity on the enactment of identity labor. Results are presented in Table SA. 13. I again found that the percent of workforce diversity did not interact with anticipatory threat to significantly predict identity labor ($b = 0.00, t = -0.62, p = ns.$). Second, I ran a moderated regression analysis to assess the moderating influence of climate for inclusion. Results are presented in Table SA. 14. I found that climate for inclusion did not interact with anticipatory threat to predict identity labor ($b = -0.02, t = -0.29, p = ns.$). However, I did find a marginally significant main effect of climate for inclusion, such that higher levels of climate for inclusion led to significantly lower levels of identity labor ($b = -0.44, t = -1.85, p = .07$).

**TABLE SA. 13**

Study 4B: Workforce Diversity Moderated Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identity Labor T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Workforce Diversity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Threat T2 x Workforce Diversity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Standard errors are in parentheses; N = 167 observations.

Unstandardized regression coefficients reported.

**TABLE SA. 14**

Study 4B: Climate for Inclusion Moderated Regression Analysis
Taken together, these analyses did not provide support for the predictions that higher levels of demographic diversity or a higher climate for inclusion attenuate the effect of anticipatory threat on identity labor. While climate for inclusion did not act as a moderator, I did some evidence that climate for inclusion significantly reduced the enactment of identity labor. However, these results suggest that even when individuals are within a high climate for inclusion, they may still feel the need to suppress their experiences of identity-based threat by engaging in identity labor.
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