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This study examined the relationship between acculturation, demographic similarity, work attitude similarity, and the quality of the leader-member exchange. Hispanic participants were recruited from the Department of Public Social Services in Riverside County, California. Participants in the study completed the Bi-dimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS) to assess their level of acculturation. They also completed the LMX-7 scale to assess the quality of leader/member exchange. A work related attitude scale and a demographic form was used to measure the degree of employee's perceived similarity with their supervisors. Perceived demographic and work attitude similarity predicted the quality of the leader-member exchange. Acculturation did not account for any additional variance.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Leader-Member Exchange Theory

Relationship development approaches to the study of leadership have been a focus of research for the past 30 years. Specifically, studies focused on the development of the relationship between leaders and subordinates in the organization. Early research on this topic found that leaders do not have the same type of relationship with all of their subordinates. Leaders tend to differentiate on how they relate to each subordinate in their units (Liden & Graen, 1980).

The Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory was the answer for researchers trying to determine how and why leaders developed different types of relationships with each of their unit members. The Vertical Dyad Linkage (VDL) explained that a “vertical exchange” takes place between leaders and subordinates and that the type of exchange depends on the subordinates’ competence and skills, and on the degree of trust the leader has for each specific subordinate. Those subordinates who are perceived to have competence and skills and who can be trusted to assume
greater responsibilities in the organization are considered to be part of the "in-group". As a result, there's greater interpersonal exchange between the leader and subordinates and subordinates receive higher job latitude, a role in decision making, and more support and consideration from their leader (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975).

In contrast, those subordinates who can not be trusted and who seem to lack the skills necessary to perform their duties are considered to be part of the "out-group" (Liden & Graen, 1980). In this case, the leader and subordinates mostly rely on the employment contract and their interaction becomes formal. Consequently, there's minimal social exchange and members limit themselves to fulfill the duties required by the employment contract. A leader in this type of relationship does not give the subordinates job latitude, a role in decision making, or consideration and support (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975; Liden & Graen, 1980).

The Vertical Dyad Linkage theory was the basis for considerate research on the development of the relationship that arises between leaders and subordinates. Subsequent research led to refinements in VDL that resulted in a newer version of leadership theory. Specifically, the new
version of this theory is called The Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX), and it has been widely used in recent years (Scandura, & Lankau, 1996).

Parallel to VDL, the main premise of the Leader Member-Exchange theory is that leaders develop different types of relationships with each subordinate as they define the role of the subordinate in the organization (Day & Crain, 1992; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Yukl, 1998). According to this theory, leaders develop "high quality" relationships with a small group of subordinates. This type of relationship is characterized by mutual trust, greater interaction, mutual respect, and reciprocal influence and support (Dockery & Steiner, 1990). Subordinates who have high quality relationships with their leaders are considered part of the "in-group" in their organization. Consequently, they obtain desired outcomes such as pay increases, promotions, better schedules, and additional feedback. Within this type of relationship, leaders grant more responsibility and autonomy to subordinates regarding their job (Day & Crain, 1992; Dockery & Steiner, 1990; and Yukl 1998).

The other type of relationship leaders might develop with their subordinates is "low quality". This type of
relationship is role defined and is characterized by unidimensional downward influence (Dockery & Steiner, 1990). The leader-subordinate interaction is strictly related to the duties, rules, standards, and procedures regarding a specific job (Ashkanasy, & O'Connor, 1997; Dockery & Steiner, 1990; Yukl, 1998.) In this case, subordinates are considered members of the "out-group". Thus, they are assigned limited responsibilities, limited autonomy, and they only receive rewards that are standard in organizations (e.g. base pay & fringe benefits) (Ashkanasy, & O’Connor, 1997; Dockery & Steiner, 1990; Yukl, 1998).

The quality of the leader-member exchange, whether high or low, influences several factors that contribute to the success of an organization. A high quality exchange between leaders and subordinates leads to higher job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance (Engle & Lord, 1997; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Meglino, Ravlin, and Adkins, 1992; Yukl, 1998). As a result, recent leadership studies focused on variables that moderate or predict the quality of the leader-member exchange. For example, several studies have found that perceived similarity and affect (i.e. liking) significantly
predict the quality of leader-member interaction (Day & Crain, 1992; Dockery & Steiner, 1990; Engle & Lord, 1997; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). Interestingly, it is often assumed that perception of similarity between individuals involves a process of high-order cognition whereby people accurately retrieve social information from environmental sources (i.e. people, behavior) (Solso, 1995, chap.3). However, this idea that perception of similarity involves high-order cognition is often untrue.

The Implicit Leadership Theory (Maurer & Lord, 1991) explains that individuals usually base their attributions of similarity on an automatic cognitive process that categorizes the target individual based on a few salient stimuli (e.g. gender, ethnicity, age, etc.). Research on this topic reveals that individuals have the tendency to oversimplify and categorize their surroundings. In terms of the leader-member relationship, subordinates create a prototype or a conceptual structure of how leaders should behave and what type of attributes they should obtain (Bryman, 2001). This prototypical conception influences individual's perception of actual behavior and the degree of perceived similarity to others (Bryman, 2001; Ling,
Based on the extensive array of empirical evidence for the Implicit Leadership Theory, it is implied that leaders and their subordinates utilize this automatic cognitive process as they perceive the degree of similarity between their attitudes, personality, demographic characteristics, and work values (Engle & Lord, 1997).

In addition, a few studies that focused on finding variables that predict the quality of leader-member exchange found that perceived and actual similarity in factors such as attitudes, personality, and values were positively correlated to the affective component (i.e., liking) of the Leader Member Exchange Theory (Day & Crain, 1992; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). For example, if a supervisor perceived that a subordinate had similar attitudes regarding family or work, the supervisor had a positive affect (i.e., liking) towards that particular employee.

Moreover, there is strong empirical evidence supporting the association between liking and the quality of the leader-member exchange, suggesting that similarity between leaders and members on various dimensions directly
correlates with leader-member interaction (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). Consequently, the association between affect and LMX implies a relationship between similarity and the quality of the leader/subordinate dyad. Thus, through empirical support we can conclude that if people in a dyadic relationship perceive that they are compatible in different dimensions, they will like each other, and as a result, they will establish a high quality relationship of mutual trust, support, and loyalty (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Similarity and Leader-Member Exchange

As previously mentioned, there is extensive empirical support for the association between similarity and Leader-Member exchange (LMX). For example, Engle and Lord (1997) conducted research to determine whether perceived similarity and liking significantly predicted the quality of leader-member exchange. In their study, supervisors and subordinates from an electric company filled out a questionnaire that contained items regarding their perceived attitudinal similarity, implicit leadership theories, implicit performance theories, liking, and leader-member exchange quality. Using correlations and a hierarchical regression analysis, the researchers found that subordinates’ liking of their supervisors and supervisors’ liking of their subordinates’ both positively correlated with their ratings of LMX. Furthermore, the relationship between perceived attitudinal similarity and LMX was mediated by the affective component (i.e. liking).

Phillips and Bedeian (1994) reported similar findings. Perceptions of leader-member attitudinal similarity
correlated with the quality of the leader-member exchange. Researchers found that leaders developed different types of relationships with their subordinates depending on their perceived attitudinal similarity. Nurses and their immediate supervisors from a large hospital filled out a questionnaire to assess their similarity in attitudes (e.g. family, money, career strategies, education etc.) between them. Participants then completed the Leader-Member Exchange Scale (Graen, Liden, & Hoel, 1982) to measure the quality of their relationship. Phillips and Bedeian (1994) concluded that the quality of leader-member exchange was positively correlated with attitudinal similarity.

In addition to attitudes, several researchers found that congruency in work values between leaders and their subordinates influenced the quality of their relationship (Ashkanasy & O’Connor, 1997; Steiner, 1987). For example, Ashkanasy and O’Connor (1997) found that the quality of the leader-member exchange depended on the degree of value similarity (e.g. achievement and obedience) between leaders and their subordinates. Both leaders and subordinates from service and industrial companies in Australia filled out a version of the Rokeach Value Survey to measure the similarity of values between them. Next, subjects
completed Liden and Graen’s (1980) multidimensional measure of the quality of leader-member relationship. Leaders were then interviewed to find their opinion regarding their relationship with subordinates. Following the interview, the researchers conducted a factor analysis to establish the value domains of leaders and subordinates. Through a MANOVA analysis they found that the leader-member exchange quality was higher when leaders and subordinates shared similar achievement and obedience values.

Although extensive research has been conducted to discover predictors or factors related to LMX, most of the studies that examined this dyad did not consider the quality of the relationship that might evolve between leaders and subordinates with different demographic characteristics or cultural backgrounds (Scandura & Lankau, 1996). However, in recent years, researchers found that “Relational Demography” is a concept that can explain how demographic differences at the individual level can influence the relationship between supervisors and subordinates (Tsui, & O’Reilly, 1989; Tsui & Farh, 1997; Epitropaki & Martin, 1999).
Relational Demography

Relational demography refers to the comparative demographic characteristics of members in dyads or groups who engage in regular interactions (Tsui & O'Reilly, 1989). Specifically, the term has been used to describe the differences in demographic characteristics between supervisors and their subordinates (Epitropaki & Martin, 1999). The relational demography concept is based on the self-categorization theory and the similarity-attraction paradigm.

According to the self-categorization theory, "people use social characteristics (e.g. gender, race, age) to define psychological groups and to promote a positive self-image" (Tsui & Egan, 1992). Individuals classify themselves and others based on these social characteristics. Research evidence demonstrates that once people classify others into social psychological groups, people have strong preferences for those who are in same psychological group as themselves (i.e. in-group). In other words, the level of attraction between individuals depends on whether they perceive other individuals as similar or dissimilar to themselves. The more people perceive they have similar demographic characteristics to others, the
higher the level of interpersonal attraction between them (Epitropaki & Martin, 1999).

Interestingly, research on relational demography found that this concept is related to important organizational outcomes including employee ratings, employee selection, turnover, and organizational commitment. In addition, relational demography has been related to work attitudes, and the quality of leader-member exchange (Tsui, & O’Reilly, 1989; Tsui & Farh, 1997; Epitropaki & Martin, 1999).

Although some research has focused on the effects of similarity or dissimilarity of demographic characteristics on the quality of the relationship between leaders and subordinates, research has not focused on investigating the effects of differences in cultural backgrounds within this dyad. Therefore, the present study focused on the quality of the relationship that arises between leaders and subordinates who have different cultural backgrounds and different levels of acculturation.

Acculturation

Acculturation is defined as a multidimensional process of interaction that takes place between two cultures.
Throughout this process there's an exchange of customs, attitudes, and values from one culture to the other (Felix-Ortiz, Newcomb, and Myers, 1994). Specifically, acculturation is the process of adaptation that members from the minority culture experience as they interact with the majority dominant-culture (Kerner, 1996; Negy & Woods, 1992). As the minority group has direct, continuous contact with the majority culture, there's a transfer of cultural elements from one group to the other (Marin, Sabogal, and Perez-Stable, 1987; Orozco, Thompson, and Kapes, 1993).

Studies discovered that during this transfer of culture, the minority group adopts the customs, behaviors, attitudes, and values from the dominant culture (Mendoza, 1989; Negy & Woods, 1992; Orozco et al., 1993). Furthermore, studies found that within the context of the United States those who are not part of the Anglo-American culture are considered to be acculturated when they have assimilated the customs, attitudes, and values of the Anglo-American culture. The greater the adoption of the Anglo-American culture, the higher their level of acculturation (Dawson, Crano, and Burgoo, 1996; Negy & Woods, 1992).
Research on the acculturation process of individuals has increased over the last several years. This interest in people’s level of acculturation is the result of changes in demographics in the United States. Specifically, research has focused on Hispanic samples. Studies revealed that measuring individuals’ level of acculturation is important because this construct is related to several important variables. According to research, acculturation is associated with a person’s mental health status, political and social attitudes, alcohol and drug use, levels of social support available, cigarette smoking, and risks of coronary heart disease (Kerner, 1996; Marin, Sabogal, & Perez-Stable, 1987).

Early research on the assessment of Hispanics’ level of acculturation typically used a linear and unidimensional model to describe acculturation scores. The acculturation measures developed following this linear model depicted acculturation as the process whereby individuals move from one cultural domain (i.e. Hispanic) to the other (i.e. non-Hispanic). A linear model implies that as individuals adopt the new culture (i.e. host culture), they move away from the value system and customs of their native culture (Marin & Gamba, 1996; Mendoza, 1989).
One major criticism of scales based on this linear model is that these unidimensional scales do not yield scores for people who score low or high on acceptance of both the native and the host culture (Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995). Thus, to address the shortcomings of this linear model, current research on acculturation is focusing on the theoretical model that depicts acculturation as a fluid process in which immigrants move through a bidirectional continuum. This bidirectional model of acculturation implies that individuals can move away from their native culture to adopt the host culture, or they can equally adopt the native and host culture to create an alternative culture (Cortes, Rogler, & Malgady, 1994; Cuellar Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995; Felix-Ortiz, Newcomb, & Myers, 1994).

Research outcomes based on the bidirectional model of acculturation indicated that this model allows researchers to measure levels of immersion into the host and native cultures. According to research, it is possible that individuals are both highly acculturated in both the native and host cultures. Similarly, measures based on the bidirectional model of acculturation can assess if individuals have low levels immersion into the two cultures.
Examples of recently developed multidimensional or bi-cultural scales assessing Hispanics' level of acculturation include the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA-II) (Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995), The Cultural Life Style Inventory (Mendoza, 1989), The Multidimensional Measure of Cultural Identity for Adolescents (Felix-Ortiz, et al., 1994), and Multidimensional Acculturation Scale for Puerto Rican Adults (Cortes et al., 1994). Although these scales independently measure culture orientation towards the native and host culture, they have several restrictions that limit the generalizability of their scores.

First, most of the recently developed bi-dimensional scales assess the acculturation level of specific populations. The majority of the scales measure the acculturation level of Mexican and Puerto Rican groups. Thus, they may not be appropriate for measuring the level of acculturation of other Hispanic populations that reside in the United States. Second, a few of these bi-dimensional scales use student samples to conduct validation studies. Therefore, they can not be used to
assess the level of acculturation of the general Hispanic population.

To address the limitations of the most recently developed multicultural acculturation scales, Marin and Gamba (1996) developed the Bi-dimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS). In their study, telephone interviews with 254 Hispanic residents from the San Francisco area were conducted. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain responses to 60-items regarding possible acculturative changes that a Hispanic person might undergo during the acculturation process. In addition, demographic information was obtained through the interviews including generation, length of residency in the U.S., and level of education. Following the telephone interviews, they conducted a principal components factor analysis with oblique rotation to identify equivalent factor scales from the original 60-items. Three language related sub-scales that measured the two dimensions (i.e. Hispanic & Non-Hispanic) emerged from these analytical procedures.

After the factor analytical procedures, Marin and Gamba (1996) computed alpha coefficients for each of the sub-scales in each cultural domain to establish the reliability of the newly developed scale. As expected by
the researchers, results of the reliability study indicated high internal consistency for the combined score of the three language-related sub-scales (alpha= .90 for Hispanic domain and alpha= .97 for the Non-Hispanic domain). Following the reliability analysis, Marin and Gamba performed a series of correlations to validate the language-related sub-scales. Participants’ scores on the overall scales were correlated with demographic criteria previously collected. High correlations between scores and various criteria revealed that the three language related sub-scales were valid (e.g. Linguistic Proficiency Sub-scale/generation/non-Hispanic domain= .61, Hispanic= -.58). However, the validation correlations of the overall scale were lower (e.g. generation /non-Hispanic domain = .50, Hispanic domain= -.42).

Furthermore, Marin and Gamba (1996) conducted separate validity analysis for participants with a Mexican background and those with a Central American background. They concluded that the validity coefficients for the two Hispanic groups were comparable to those obtained from the whole sample (e.g. Central Americans/generation/non-Hispanic = .52. Hispanic = -.7). Thus, the researchers concluded that the BAS provided a valid acculturation
assessment for several Hispanic populations (i.e. Mexican Americans and Central Americans).

Purpose of This Study

In light of the increase of Hispanic immigrants (i.e. 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} generation) in the U.S. workforce and the impact that the quality of the leader-member exchange has on the organization's success, this study investigated the quality of the relationship that emerges between Hispanic subordinates and Anglo-American leaders (i.e. who are most representative of the U.S. dominant culture).

It is hypothesized, from the subordinate's perspective, that perceived attitudinal and demographic similarity (i.e. gender, age, education) between leaders and subordinates will predict the quality of the leader-member exchange. Specifically, Hispanic subordinates who perceive that they have similar demographics and work attitudes with their Anglo-American leaders (i.e. supervisors) will have a higher quality leader-member exchange than those who perceive themselves to be less similar to their supervisors.

It is also hypothesized that the level of acculturation of a Hispanic subordinate predicts the
quality of the leader-member exchange beyond perceived degree of similarity between their work attitudes and demographic characteristics. Hispanic subordinates with high levels of acculturation to the U.S. culture will have a high quality exchange with their Anglo-American supervisor. Those subordinates with low levels of acculturation will have a low quality exchange with their supervisor. In addition, it is hypothesized that those who are Bi-cultural (i.e. high scores in both the non-Hispanic and Hispanic domains) have a lower quality of exchange with their supervisors than those who are highly acculturated (i.e. high score in non-Hispanic dimension).
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Two hundred male and female Hispanic Eligibility Technicians (ETs) and Office Assistants (OAs) were recruited from the Department of Public Social Services in Riverside County, California. Out of the two hundred questionnaires sent to the employees, 76 were returned (i.e. 39% return rate). However, because of the particular dyads of interest (see next paragraph), only 49 out of the 76 questionnaires were used for this study. Data were collected from all Hispanic ETs and OAs in TAMD units; however, data provided by Hispanic employees who had Anglo-American supervisors were the main focus for the present study. This study focused on the Hispanic population due to the lack of research on acculturation as a possible predictor of the quality of the relationship that develops between supervisors and their subordinates. Data were collected from several Temporary Assistance Medical Division units located in Cathedral City, Hemet, Riverside, Moreno Valley, Blythe, Norco, and Temecula. The ethnic composition of these units included: 62% Caucasians,
9% Blacks, 3% Asians, and about 26% Hispanics. Out of the Hispanic employees, about 96% of them were registered as bilingual. The level of education for Eligibility Technicians and Office Assistants ranged from a high school education to a Bachelor Degree.

All participants were treated according to the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Measures

Bi-Dimensional Acculturation Scale

The Bi-dimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS) (Marin, & Gamba, 1996) measured Hispanic employee’s level of acculturation to the U.S. (Appendix D). This measure contained three sub-scales with 12 four-point Likert-type items for each of the two cultural dimensions (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic). The sub-scales measured three language related areas (i.e. Language Use, Linguistic Proficiency, and Electronic Media) and contained items such as: “How often do you speak English?” “How well do you understand t.v. programs in English?” and “How often do you listen to radio programs in English?”. Respondents used a scale ranging from 1 (low acculturation) to 4 (high...
acculturation), a higher score meant a higher level of acculturation. This scale had high reliability ($\alpha = .82$) for the non-Hispanic domain and ($\alpha = .89$) for the Hispanic domain.

**Leader-Member Exchange Scale**

The quality of the supervisor/subordinate relationship was measured with the LMX-7 (Scandura & Graen, 1984) (Appendix F). This scale consisted of seven items that had a four-point multiple-choice response format. Respondents used a scale ranging from 1 to 4; the higher numbers represented a high quality exchange between the supervisor and the subordinate (i.e., employee). Some example items from the LMX-7 included: “How well does your supervisor understand your potential?” “How well does your supervisor understands your job problems and needs?” and “How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?” High scores on the LMX-7 indicated high-quality relationships between supervisors and their subordinates. The LMX-7 had high internal consistency ($\alpha = .93$).

**Work Attitude Scale**

The degree of perceived similarity in work attitudes between Anglo-American supervisors and Hispanic
subordinates was measured with a revised version of the Liden et al. (1993) work attitude scale (Appendix G). New items were developed for this scale and a pilot study was conducted to assess the psychometric characteristics of the scale.

Sixty Cal State San Bernardino students who were currently working were recruited from Psychology classes. Ten participants were required for each item to assess the unidimensionality of the 6-item scale through factor analysis. The scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A high score on the scale indicated that students (i.e. employee) perceived a high degree of similarity in work attitudes with their supervisor.

Participants in the study were first asked to answer standard questions to identify demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, job classification, and amount of time working with their immediate supervisor. Next, participants were instructed to complete the modified version of Liden et al. (1993) similarity work attitude scale.

A principal components analysis was conducted in the pilot study to determine if all six items of the work attitude scale contributed to a single dimension. Results
suggested that the work attitude scale was unidimensional. One factor was extracted from the items accounting for 71% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 4.26. The scale had high internal consistency (α = .95) and high inter-item correlations (see Appendix A for item statistics).

Demographic Questionnaire

Participants were asked to complete a form requesting general demographic information (e.g. ethnicity, age, gender, education, generation, number of years in the U.S., job classification, etc.) (Appendix H). In addition, to measure relational demography, the form included questions regarding the ethnicity, age, gender, and level of education of their immediate supervisor.

Scores on this measure were created by squaring the difference in demographic characteristics between Hispanic Subordinates and their Anglo-American immediate supervisors. This difference was squared to obtain an absolute difference score.

The scores when dealing with a continuous variable were interpreted exponentially. For example, in terms of age, a difference score of 1 meant that the supervisor-subordinate dyad differed by one year. A score of 9 for age meant that they differed by three years. For a
dichotomous variable such as gender, a 0 indicated that the Hispanic subordinate and the Anglo-American immediate supervisor did not differ in gender. A score of 1 meant that they were of different genders.

Procedure

Participants were selected from a list of Hispanic employees who were identified as bilingual in The Department of Public Social Services (DPSS). They were selected from this list because of the high percentage of bilingual employees who were Hispanic (i.e. 96%).

A sealed envelope with three questionnaires and a demographic form was sent through the DPSS inter-departmental mail system to all participants. Each employee received a self-addressed envelope. Participants were instructed to use the envelope to return the signed informed consent and the survey directly to the researcher. Participants were also instructed to use their immediate supervisor as their reference as they completed the attitudinal scale and the leader-member exchange questionnaires. First, participants completed the Bi-dimensional Acculturation Scale (BAS) to assess their level of acculturation to the U.S. culture.
Following the measure of acculturation, participants completed the LMX-7. This scale contained items pertaining to the quality of the relationship between subordinates (i.e. Hispanic employees) and their immediate Anglo-American supervisors. Participants then filled out the newly revised Liden’s et al. (1993) work attitude scale to measure their perceived similarity in work related attitudes to their immediate supervisors.

Finally, through a debriefing statement, participants received a brief explanation of the nature of the study, and they were thanked for their cooperation.

Analysis

A hierarchical regression analysis tested the predictions. The leader-member exchange scale was the dependent variable. The order of variable entry followed the analytical logic that perceived attitudinal and demographic similarity have a primary effect on the quality of the leader-member exchange and that level of acculturation explains variance beyond perceived attitudinal and demographic similarity. Descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables were also computed.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Descriptive Analysis

The present study was conducted to assess a linear association between demographic characteristics (i.e. age, gender, education), work attitudes, level of acculturation (i.e. to the dominant and native culture) and the quality of leader member-exchange. Before conducting the regression analyses, descriptive statistics were run. The correlations, means, and standard deviations of the variables can be found in Appendix B. See Appendix C for the correlation matrix.

Prior to conducting a regression analysis, the variables were analyzed to meet the assumptions of univariate normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. All variables but the acculturation met these assumptions. The descriptive analyses indicated that the acculturation (i.e. non-Hispanic domain) factor was negatively skewed. This variable was reflected and square rooted to meet the assumption of normality.
Regression Analysis

The hierarchical regression revealed that the first hypothesis in this study was supported (Appendix D). Perceived attitudinal and demographic similarity between leaders and subordinates predicted the quality of leader-member exchange \([R = .80, R^2 = .64, \text{F}(4,44) = 19.57, P<.05]\). Hispanic subordinates who perceived that they had similar demographic characteristics and similar work related attitudes had a higher quality leader-member exchange than those who perceived differences. The variables in this step accounted for 64\% of the variance. This variance can be attributed to the similarity in work attitude variable (\(\beta = .79, p < .05\)).

The second hypothesis in this analysis was not supported. The level of acculturation of a Hispanic subordinate to the U.S. culture (i.e. transformed non-Hispanic domain) did not significantly predict the quality of leader-member exchange beyond that afforded by perception in attitudinal and demographic similarity \([R^2\text{change} = .005, \text{F}(1,43) = .62, p = .43]\). The regression model that included acculturation did not explain additional variance than the model with similarity in demography and work attitudes.
In addition, the results revealed that the third hypothesis predicted was not supported. A multiplicative variable composed of the non-Hispanic domain score and the Hispanic domain score was entered in the hierarchical regression as a third step. Participants who were bi-cultural (i.e. high scores on transformed non-Hispanic and Hispanic domains) did not have lower quality LMX with their supervisors than those who were highly acculturated (i.e. high scores on transformed non-Hispanic domain)\[ R^2 \text{change} < .001, F(1,41) = .12, p = .74].
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The current investigation was an attempt to find factors that might contribute to the quality of the relationship that arises between leaders and subordinates. Specifically, the purpose of this investigation was to find if perceived demographic similarity, similarity in work attitudes, and acculturation would predict the quality of the leader-member exchange.

Similar to previously conducted studies on factors predicting LMX, the present study found support for the first hypothesis stating that perceived demographic similarity and similarity in work values predict the quality of leader-member exchange. The hierarchical regression analysis revealed a significant effect for this model when entered in the first step. These factors accounted for 64% of the total variance. These results paralleled other results found in existing literature pertaining to factors predicting the quality of leader-member exchange and thus suggest that perception of similarity, from the subordinate's perspective, plays an important role in predicting the quality of the
relationship that arises between leaders and subordinates in Hispanic-Anglo dyads (Liden et al., 1993).

Interestingly, this study did not support the hypothesis that acculturation, in either Hispanic or non-Hispanic domain, predicts the quality of LMX beyond perceived similarity in demographics and similarity in work attitudes. The acculturation variable did not account for any additional variance. Thus, based on these results, it can be concluded that an individual’s level of acculturation is not as important as perception of similarity (i.e. demographic characteristics and work attitudes) when trying to determine the quality of the relationship that arises between Anglo-American leaders and Hispanic subordinates. Specifically, these results suggest that perception of similarity in work related attitudes may be more fundamental to what subordinates find relevant in a leader.

Limitations

There are a few possible reasons why acculturation did not add to the prediction of LMX. First, the study only included a small sample of participants (n = 49). This small sample affected the statistical power of the results
in this investigation. Perhaps participants with low levels of acculturation to the U.S. American culture were reluctant to return the questionnaires due to possible perceived negative consequences resulting from them answering questions pertaining to their immediate supervisor. Perhaps Hispanics with low levels of immersion to the dominant U. S. culture felt part of the out-group in the organization. Consequently, they felt that they could not afford to have their individual answers disclosed to DPSS.

Participants were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of the study through the informed consent and the debriefing statement. However, some still felt uncomfortable returning the questionnaires. A few of the participants made phone calls to enquire about the confidentiality of the study. Participants were again reassured that their individual responses were confidential.

In addition, the questionnaires were distributed through the inter-department mail system. This method of distribution seemed very impersonal. A presentation at each Temporary Assistance Medical Division Unit may have been more effective in recruiting participants. A
presentation was not done because DPSS management suggested that a presentation to Eligibility Technicians and Office Assistants would single these employees out as a group. DPSS considered this inappropriate.

Another possible reason why acculturation did not significantly predict the quality of leader-member exchange is that this construct did not tap into the perception of similarity variance. Acculturation has to do with similarities and differences between people as they adapt to a new dominant culture. When people acculturate to the majority culture, they assimilate and adopt the customs, attitudes, behaviors, and values of the dominant culture. Thus, they become similar in terms of attitudes, values, and behaviors with members of the dominant culture (Mendoza, 1989; Negy & Woods, 1992; Orozco et al., 1993).

Although previous research on acculturation indicated assimilation of culture, in this study, acculturation did not explain variance beyond perceived similarity (i.e. demographic and work attitude similarity) between Hispanic subordinates and Anglo-American leaders.

Another possible reason why acculturation did not significantly predict LMX is that the Bi-dimensional Acculturation Scale (BAS), like most of the existing
acculturation scales, is language-based. This scale does not measure other areas of acculturational change. Acculturation should also be assessed with scales that have a social behavior base. For example, measuring the level of acculturation in terms of changes in individuals’ values, customs, and norms might be a more effective way of investigating the process of acculturation. Future research on this topic should focus on using a psychometrically sound acculturation scale that contains both social behavior and language-based items.

Furthermore, the tendency of the Hispanic population to acquiesce is a possible reason why this study did not find support for acculturation as a possible predictor of LMX. Research on acculturation revealed that Hispanic participants who have low levels of acculturation have the tendency to give extreme and acquiescent responses on Likert type scales (Hui & Triandis, 1989; Marin, Gamba, and Marin, 1992). Several studies showed that this type of response format can modify the way the variance and mean distributions of a measure are interpreted. Thus, future research should take this into consideration when using Hispanic populations and Likert-type scales.
Implications

Although the present study had several limitations including the small sample size, the limitation of a language-based acculturation scale, and possibly acquiescence from the Hispanic sample, the study still provides important evidence supporting previous literature regarding the strong association that exists between perception of similarity and LMX. A strong association was found between similarity in demographic characteristics and work attitudes and the quality of the leader-member exchange in a minority sample.

This finding is of great importance to organizations that want to determine factors associated with the type and quality of relationship that arises between employees and their supervisors. As previously stated, the quality of this dyadic relationship is related to employee performance, turnover rates, productivity, job commitment, role clarity, role conflict, job attitudes, desirability of work assignments, overall job satisfaction, performance evaluations, frequency of promotions, leader attention, and leader support (Liden et al. 1993; Duarte et al., 1994; Gerstner & Day, 1997). Therefore, it would behoove the research community to discover factors that might predict
the Leader-Member Exchange construct. In addition, future research should investigate Leader-Member Exchange in different organizational settings to improve the generalizability and external validity of research findings.

Furthermore, future research should focus on determining the effects of an individual’s level of acculturation on the quality of the relationship that arises between leaders and subordinates. Specifically, research should discern if acculturation actually predicts this interaction. The main premise of the acculturation theory explains that as individuals from the minority culture adapt to the new dominant culture, there’s a transfer of cultural elements from one culture to the other (Feliz-Ortiz, et al. 1994). Thus, members from both the native culture and the dominant culture become similar in terms of their values, attitudes, and customs. Future research should focus on tapping into this perception of similarity either by using an acculturation scale that assesses acculturation based on social behavioral changes, or by using a scale that does not have a Liker-type response format that might influence the interpretation of studies with Hispanic samples.
APPENDIX A:

WORK ATTITUDE SCALE

CORRELATIONS
### Work Attitude Scale Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work v1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work v2</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work v3</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work v4</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work v5</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work v6</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations are significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).
APPENDIX B:

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND
PEARSON CORRELATIONS
### Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r(LMX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader-Member Exchange</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New acculturation Non-Hispanic domain</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acculturation Hispanic domain</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Similarity of work attitude</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Education similarity</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender similarity</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age similarity</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**  
$r$(LMX) = Pearson correlations between the leader-member exchange and other variables. $N =$ number of participants; $SD =$ Standard deviation; $*p < .05$ (one-tailed). The Means for education, gender and age similarity reflect mean differences between supervisors' and subordinates' demographic characteristics.
APPENDIX C:

CORRELATION MATRIX
## Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Education</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Gender</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Work</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Acculturation</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Acculturation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leader-member</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.79*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note
Correlations are significant at 0.05 level (one-tailed).
APPENDIX D:

SUMMARY OF HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis ($N = 49$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables entered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity work attitude</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age similarity</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education similarity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender similarity</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>$R^2 = .64$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables entered in block 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity work attitude</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age similarity</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education similarity</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender similarity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable entered in block 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New acculturation</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>$R^2 = .65$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Hispanic domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables entered in block 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity work attitude</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age similarity</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education similarity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered in block 2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation Hispanic domain</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>R² = .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation non-Hispanic domain</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable entered in block 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation-Hispanic &amp; non-Hispanic domain</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>R² = .66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**  
R² = .64 for step 1; R² = .65 for block 2 in hypothesis 2; R² = .66 for block 3 (*p < .05).  
B = Unstandardized beta; β = Standardized beta.
APPENDIX E:

BI-DIMENSIONAL ACCULTURATION

SCALE
DIRECTIONS: Please answer questions 1-6 and circle the number that best describes your answer.

1. How often do you speak English?  
   never 1 2 3 4
   almost 1 2 3 4
   sometimes 1 2 3 4
   often 1 2 3 4
   almost always 1 2 3 4

2. How often do you speak English with your friends?  
3. How often do you think in English?  
4. How often do you speak Spanish?  
5. How often do you speak Spanish with your friends?  
6. How often do you think in Spanish?  

Please answer questions 7-18 and circle the number that best describes your answer.

7. How well do you speak English?  
   very poorly 1 2 3 4
   poorly 1 2 3 4
   well 1 2 3 4
   very well 1 2 3 4

8. How well do you read in English?  
9. How well do you understand television programs in English?  
10. How well do you understand radio programs in English?  
11. How well do you write in English?  
12. How well do you understand music in English?  
13. How well do you speak Spanish?  
14. How well do you read in Spanish?  
15. How well do you understand television programs in Spanish?  
16. How well do you understand radio programs in Spanish?  
17. How well do you write in Spanish?  
18. How well do you understand music in Spanish?
Please answer questions 19-24 and circle the number that best describes your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. How often do you watch television programs in English?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How often do you listen to radio programs in English?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How often do you listen to music in English?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How often do you watch television programs in Spanish?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How often do you listen to radio programs in Spanish?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How often do you listen to music in Spanish?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F:

LEADER–MEMBER EXCHANGE SCALE
DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability and circle the number that best describes your answer. NOTE: Think about your IMMEDIATE Supervisor as you answer these questions.

1) Do you usually feel that you know where you stand...do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never know where I stand</th>
<th>Seldom know where I stand</th>
<th>Usually know where I stand</th>
<th>Always know where I stand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor understands your problems and needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Some but not enough</th>
<th>Well enough</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Some but not enough</th>
<th>As much as the next person</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Regardless of how much formal authority your immediate supervisor has built into his/her position, what are the chances that he/she would be personally inclined to use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Might or Might not</th>
<th>Probably would</th>
<th>Certainly would</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your immediate supervisor has, to what extent can you count on him or her to “bail you out” at his or her expense when you really need it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Might or Might not</th>
<th>Probably would</th>
<th>Certainly would</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decisions if he or she were not present to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Probably would</th>
<th>Certainly would</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) How would you characterize your working relationship with your immediate supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than average</th>
<th>About average</th>
<th>Better than average</th>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G:

SIMILARITY IN WORK ATTITUDE

SCALE
Directions: Please answer the following question to the best of your ability and circle the number that best describes your answer. Note: Think of your immediate Supervisor as you answer these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number that best describes your answer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) My supervisor and I handle work problems in a similar way.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) My supervisor and I see things at work in much the same way.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) My supervisor and I are similar in terms of outlook, perspective, and work values.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) My supervisor and I think alike in terms of coming up with similar solutions for work problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) My supervisor and I analyze work problems in a similar way.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) My supervisor and I are alike in a number of areas.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H:

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTIONS:
1) There are several sections in this survey. Please read the directions before you complete each section.
2) Once you have completed the survey, please mail it through the DPSS intra-departmental mailing system no later than (11-17-00). (A self-addressed envelope is provided).
*Note: The H.R. Department generated the label with your name. Once you return the survey in the sealed self-addressed envelope, there’s no way of knowing your identity. Your information will remain anonymous.

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

Your country of origin: ____________________________

Number of years in the United States (if not born in the U.S.) ________.

Ethnicity: (please circle one)
A. Hispanic/Latino
B. Anglo-American/White
C. African American/Black
D. Asian American/Asian
E. Native American
Other: (please specify) __________________________

Generation: (Please check that generation that you belong to. Check one only)
___1st Generation (If you and all of your parents and grandparents where born outside the U.S.)
___2nd Generation (If you were born in the U.S. but all your parents and grandparents were born outside the U.S.)
___2nd Generation Mixed (If you and one parent were born in the U.S. and all others were born outside the U.S.)
___3rd Generation Mixed (If you and your parents and at least one grandparent were born in the U.S.)
___3rd Generation (If you and all of your parents and grandparents were born in the U.S.)

Your gender: (Please circle one)  Male     Female

Your age: ________

Your level of education: (please circle one)
A. Less than high school
B. High school
C. Some college
D. Technical degree
E. Bachelor’s degree
F. Some graduate courses
G. Master’s degree
H. Post Master courses
I. Doctoral degree
Type of employee: (please circle those that apply to you)
Permanent / Temporary  Full-time/ Part-time

Your job classification:__________

Amount of time working with your immediate supervisor: (Years/Months) ________

(Note: The following 4 questions pertain to your immediate supervisor. Please answer to the best of your ability).

Ethnicity of your supervisor: (please circle one)
A. Hispanic/Latino
B. Anglo-American/White
C. African American/Black
D. Asian American/Asian
E. Native American
F. Other: (please specify)

Gender of your supervisor: (please circle one)  Male    Female

Estimate the age of your supervisor:__________

Estimate the level of education of your supervisor: (please circle one)
A. Less than high school
B. High school
C. Some college
D. Technical degree
E. Bachelor’s degree
F. Some graduate courses
G. Master’s degree
H. Post Master courses
I. Doctoral degree
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