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ABSTRACT

The current study examined the internal states (self-esteem and ethnic identity) that may affect individuals in a diverse work environment and lead to conflict. In particular it was expected that ethnic identity and self-esteem would mediate the relationship between diversity and conflict. Participants from a wide variety of organizations in Southern California completed an online survey. Statistical analyses revealed that self-esteem and ethnic identity did not mediate the relationship between diversity and conflict. However, many of the variables were significantly related to each other. Implications of the findings are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

As we enter a new millennium, the population in the United States is becoming more ethnically diverse. The 2000 U.S. Census reported that there are currently 211,460,626 European Americans, 34,658,190 African Americans, 10,242,998 Asian Americans, and 35,305,818 Latino Americans currently residing in the U.S. (Bureau of Statistics). According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the minority population is growing at a faster rate than the European American population (Bureau of Statistics). Therefore, it is projected that African, Latino, and Asian Americans will continue to increase their presence within the labor force at a faster rate than Whites. Consequently, the workforce is and will become more diverse. Research has identified many costs and benefits of a diverse workforce (Aghazadeh, 2004; Jayne and Dipboye, 2004). To reduce the costs and reap the benefits of a diverse workforce, organizations will have to identify the changes that occur within their workforce in a diverse environment that might lead to work conflict. The purpose
of this thesis is to develop an understanding of the internal psychological states that affect individuals in a diverse work environment and may lead to conflict.

Model Overview

The proposed model examines how a diverse workforce environment may increase or decrease the salience of an individual's ethnic identity and self-esteem. These internal psychological states in turn may increase or decrease the amount of conflict experienced within the organization. This dynamic model may enable us gain a better understanding of the cognitive and affective processes that may help explain employee behavior and performance within a diverse workforce.

Diversity

Traditionally, organizations have managed diversity through affirmative action programs, which have historically been varied and controversial. African and Latino Americans are more likely to support affirmative action programs (Parker, Baltes, and Christiansen, 1997; Sniderman, and Carmines, 1997). In contrast, individuals from the majority group tend to have negative attitudes towards affirmative action programs (Kravitz and Klineberg,
If the majority members indeed perceive the affirmative action program negatively they may no longer support the affirmative action program and treat minority employees in a biased or unfair manner (Heilman & Blader, 2001; Slaughter, Sinar, and Bachiochi, 2002). One potential disadvantage of affirmative action programs is that they may increase the salience of such visible differences as race or gender as mechanisms for categorizing individuals (Rothbart and John, 1993). As a result, affirmative action can lead to an increase in the awareness and salience of race for individuals within the organization, and can lead to an increase in negative individual and organizational outcomes such as discrimination and decreased performance. To counter the many negative perceptions of affirmative action, many organizations began to seek other forms of diversity management, leading to the creation and introduction of diversity management programs.

Starting in the 1990s, organizations began to develop diversity management, moving beyond affirmative action as the only intervention to bolster the numbers of minorities and women in the workforce. Unlike the majority of affirmative action programs, diversity management has not
been well defined (Hon and Brunner, 2000; Williams and O’Reilly, 1998). Although the term is vague, many definitions of diversity contain race, gender, ethnicity, age, disability, sexual orientation, and religion (Human Resources Institute, 2003). As diversity management has become more widespread, differences have persisted between majority and minority group members in their attitudes toward programs that are perceived to benefit minorities. Similar to their reaction to affirmative action programs, minorities typically have more positive attitudes than do majority members towards diversity management programs (Kravitz and Klineberg, 2000). The various opinions and attitudes amongst majority and minority group members have led to a variety of outcomes, including negative attributions of the recipients of diversity management programs (Heilman, Block, and Statathatos, 1997; Matheson, Warren, Foster and Painter, 2000; McCormack, 1995; Williams and O’Reilly, 1998). To better understand the outcomes, various theories have been developed by researchers to help define diversity more comprehensively.

Costs and Benefits of Diversity

In order for organizations to manage a diverse workforce, they should have a general understanding of the
costs and benefits of diversity within an organizational setting. By being aware of the pros and cons of a diverse workforce, organizations may be able to implement a diversity management program that best suits their needs. The list of costs and benefits below are a generalized list that may or may not apply to all forms of diversity.

Benefits of Having a Diverse Workforce. Prior to the Civil Rights movement, society and organizations did not see many benefits in a diverse workforce. Few minorities occupied positions of power in this era and often worked in segregated workplaces. After the implementation of the Civil Rights Act many organizations found that there were benefits to recruiting a diverse workforce and definite disadvantages to a non-diverse workforce (i.e., costly litigation). Today, the majority of organizations would say that they are aware of the benefits of having a diverse workforce (Jayne, & Diboye, 2004).

As stated earlier, the population in the U.S. is becoming more diverse, and organizations that have a diverse workforce are expected to able to compete more successfully than organizations that have a homogeneous workforce (Konrad, 2003). The prepared organizations will be able to attract diverse applicants, and be able to
market towards the expanding diverse population (Aghazadeh, 2004). Access to the diverse applicant pool will also increase the chances that the organization will hire the most talented individuals (Konrad, 2003); organizations that fail to become diverse will be selecting from a smaller pool of applicants, which statistically reduces the chances that they will hire the most qualified individuals. Individuals from various ethnic and cultural backgrounds will be able to bring information regarding their culture’s beliefs, values, needs, and political background to the organization (Aghazadeh, 2004). With the increasing global market, it is important for organizations to attract and hire a diverse work force to be able to communicate to these markets (Konrad, 2003). Organizations that have individuals who are able to speak the language are at an advantage, because they will be able to market and communicate with many of the countries within the new global market (Aghazadeh, 2004). A diverse workforce often brings creativeness and diversity to the organization because different opinions and insight from various backgrounds will lead to new ideas (Konrad, 2003). This will increase the organization’s profits and competitiveness within the market (Aghazadeh, 2004).
An organization with a diverse workforce will be able to compete and thrive in the diverse future market. According to the 2000 U.S. census, the United States is composed of 75% white, 12.3% black, and 12.5% Latino. The minority population is expected to increase over the next century. As the minority population increases so will their economic impact. A report published by the 2004 Diversity Best Practices and Business Women's Network, found that Latinos have a combined buying power of $653 billion, African Americans have a combined buying power of $688 billion, and Asian Americans have a combined buying power of $344 billion (Sudhoff, 2004). In addition to the potential market for diverse organizations, having a diverse workforce has been found to improve the bottom lines for organizations in various ways. A 2005 Workplace Diversity Practices Survey from SHRM found that a diverse workforce could reduce costs and increase profits (Marquez, 2005). On this survey, 78% of the 400 HR professionals stated that a diverse workforce decreased costs associated with turnover, absenteeism, and low productivity. Seventy-four percent of the professionals also stated that a diverse workforce decreased costs by decreasing complaints of unfair treatment. The population and workforce are
inevitably going to become more diverse. Organizations that want to thrive in this new market will have to develop strategies to reap the full benefits of a diverse workforce.

Costs of Having a Diverse Workforce. Despite the many advantages of diversity within an organization there are disadvantages of a diverse workforce that organizations should be aware of. Researchers have found a common trend of disadvantages across various forms of diversity.

Researchers have begun to argue that diverse workforces will not necessarily mean that individuals with the best knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics will be selected (Jayne and Dipboye, 2004). Some organizations use demographic diversity as a substitute for the development of good selection measures. Selecting without regard to necessary skills will lead to a diverse group of employees who may not possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to perform needed tasks and duties efficiently and successfully. Organizations should not use diversity as a substitute for selecting the best individuals for the job, but develop good measurement tools.
Diversity can increase performance by providing creative and innovative information; however, it could also decrease performance (Aghazadeh, 2004; Jayne and Dipboye, 2004). These mixed results have led researchers to conclude that the relationship between diversity and performance is a "double-edged sword", because it can improve and hurt performance on various tasks and within various contexts (Milliken and Martins, 1996). For example, organizations that have failed to manage diversity effectively run the risk of increasing the probabilities of discrimination and stereotypes within the organization (Aghazadeh, 2004). Stereotypes and discrimination lower levels of satisfaction amongst the minority employees, which will lead them to perform at lower rates. This result suggests there may be an inverted-U relationship between diversity and performance within the workplace (Richard, McMillian, Chadwick, and Dwyer, 2003). Low rates of diversity will not increase performance because the organization will lack creativity and innovations. High rates of diversity that are improperly managed may create hostile work conditions that decrease work performance. Therefore, organizations need to be able to manage
diversity to have the highest performance possible (Richard, McMillian, Chadwick, and Dwyer, 2003).

Another possible cost of diversity programs is the possibility of litigation. The implementation of diversity programs has increased the number of reverse discrimination cases reported within organizations (Aghazadeh, 2004). Reverse discrimination has been associated with affirmative action programs, but it can also occur with other forms of diversity management (Gullet, 2000). Reverse discrimination occurs when the majority members feel that they are being unfairly treated, while minority members are receiving special treatment (Burstein, 1985). As a result of reverse discrimination, organizations run the risk of lawsuits and losing employees. However, organizations that fail to attract or hire any minority members also face lawsuits and the loss of potential talent. Organizations need to strike a balance in the implementation of any diverse program, to prevent discrimination and reverse discrimination.

One of the most daunting and serious issues within diverse organizations is the increase in conflict between majority and minority members (Aghazadeh, 2004). The conflict between these groups may manifest itself in the
form of stereotypes and discrimination (Aghazadeh, 2004). These forms of conflict occur because of a lack of acceptance, understanding or a sense of competition with members of another group. Training employees about the value of diversity can reduce stereotypes and discrimination (Aghazadeh, 2004).

Diversity often leads to higher levels of turnover (Aghazadeh, 2004; Jayne & Dipboye, 2004). Minority members are more likely to leave an organization than majority members because they may have become isolated or experienced discrimination (Aghazadeh, 2004). In addition, individuals who work with other people who are different from themselves are also more likely to leave (Jayne and Dipboye, 2004). Diversity needs to be managed well to prevent turnover, which could cost the organization talent and creativity.

Diversity has the potential to provide organizations with many benefits if it is managed correctly. It could increase productivity, decrease turnover rates, and decrease conflict. However, the cost of improper diversity management could be detrimental to the organization. Therefore diversity management not only benefits the
organization financially and productively, but it also benefits the well being of employees.

Diversity Perspectives

Researchers have identified many positive and negative aspects about diverse work forces that have developed into several separate research domains (Knippeberg, De Dreu, and Homan, 2004). Researchers have identified many research areas. Two of the most popular include the similarity-attraction perspective and the information/decision-making perspective.

The similarity/attraction perspective posits that individuals attribute positive qualities to similar individuals, and attribute negative qualities to dissimilar individuals. This theory argues that a homogenous workforce is the most productive workforce, while a diverse workforce will be unproductive as a result of group conflict, discrimination, and lack of cohesiveness (Van Knippenberg, De Dreu, and Homan, 2004). This theory helps explain the negative outcomes that occur in organizations as a result of diversity because individuals attribute and perceive individuals of different ethnicities, races, or backgrounds negatively.
On the other hand, the information/decision-making perspective has been used to explain the benefits of diversity towards organizational outcomes (Knippenberg, De Dreu, and Homan, 2004). The information/decision making perspective argues that individuals within a diverse organization have more access to information than individuals in a homogenous organization (Williams and O’Reilly, 1998). Therefore, these individuals will be more creative and are predicted to be more successful. Taken together, the two approaches provide a framework for the various positive and negative outcomes that occur in a diverse workforce. Another perspective has differentiated diversity into surface and deep levels (Mohammed and Angell, 2004). Surface-level diversity is defined as those visible characteristics that vary from one individual to the next. These would include race, gender, age, physical disabilities, and ethnic differences, while deep-level diversity are internal differences such as personality, beliefs, values, and attitudes. Traditionally, organizations have mainly cared about surface-level diversity because they have a relationship with organizational outcomes (Pelled, 1996) and have been the target of federal legislation. But should organizations
also care about deep-level diversity? Research has found that both surface and deep-level diversity can impact organizational outcomes (Harrison, Price, Gavin, and Florey, 2002). Some organizations have responded to this relationship by examining various deep-level variables, such as The Big Five traits, cognitive ability, values, and attitudes (Mohammed and Angell, 2004). Many of these organizations are currently measuring these traits to assist in their selection procedures. For example, organizations are looking for personality traits, attitudes or values that are both consistent and inconsistent with their organization’s values and culture.

Surface and deep level diversity demonstrate that individuals within organizations will find ways to differentiate and group themselves with other individuals. This lends support to a definition of diversity that states,

... the effects of diversity can result from any attribute people use to tell themselves that another person is different. A specific situation and social construction may make salient certain attributes whether or not they are relevant to the task. If salient, these
distinctions, regardless of how task-relevant they are, may lead to in-group/out-group distinctions and potentially affect group functioning (Williams and O’Reilly, p. 81, 1998).

The previous definition implies that a work environment (social situation) may make certain attributes salient. In an ethnically and racially diverse environment we would expect ethnic and racial differences to become salient.

Social Identity

Employees within an organization have an array of identities that vary in their importance across different situations (Garcia-Prieto, Bellard, & Schneider, 2003). Individuals use the various identities to define themselves as well as how they act or behave within various contexts. Social identity states that our self-concept consists of personal identity and social identity (Tajfel, & Turner, 1986). Personal identity is an aspect of an individual that is uniquely experienced, cognitively processed, and behaviorally expressed. Social identity is an aspect of an individual that is shared with a larger group. If an individual’s social or personal identity becomes salient
the other form of identity will become less salient (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994).

The various social identities not only define the individual within a particular situation, but they also define how individuals will appraise or define the same situation differently given similar cues. (Garcia-Prieto, Bellard, & Schneider, 2003). Researchers have argued that an individual's social identity varies within various times and contexts (Garcia-Prieto, Bellard, & Schneider, 2003; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). For example, these researchers have suggested that diverse work teams will increase the salience of various social identities such as ethnic identity, which may in turn influence the individual's cognitive appraisals.

Once a social identity has become salient it will influence an individual's cognitive appraisals of goals, casual attributions, control, power, and norms (Garcia-Prieto, et al., 2003). In particular, social identity can influence how important a particular goal is for an individual (Brewer, 1991). First, the social identity becomes more salient than the out-group or personal goals. Second, the salient social identity can influence an individual's casual attribution of events (Deschamps,
This process is similar to the similarity-attraction perspective where individuals attribute positive events to members of the salient identity group and negative events to members of the non-salient identity group. Third, the salient social identity will influence an individual's perception of control and power (Vannman and Miller, 1993). The amount of control and power that the salient social identity possesses depends on the in-group to out-group member ratio. Last, the salient social identity can influence which norms and values are perceived as important (Hogg & Turner, 1987). The salient social identity will dictate which values, norms, and practices are important to learn and abide by. Differences in cognitive appraisals may lead to conflict. For example, it has been suggested that members in a diverse team will arrive at different cognitive appraisals of the same events, thus leading to conflict.

Conflicts and emotions experienced are based on an individual's cognitive appraisals (Garcia-Prieto, et al., 2003). There are many social identities that can influence an individual's cognitive appraisal. In the past, researchers studying diverse teams have used surface level characteristics as a stable self-perception to categorize
and differentiate individuals (Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999). Therefore, an individual’s self-categorization (e.g. ethnicity, gender, age) will become salient when the individual perceives that difference from the group. The salience of an individual’s social identity also depends on the relevance, importance, and significance of the social identity within a setting. However, an individual’s social identity is not a stable self-perception across all situations, but rather a dynamic self-perception that changes within various situations, relationships, and environments (Garcia-Prieto, et al., 2003). An individual with strong cultural ties and a more stable social environment is more likely to develop a strong social identity salience for his or her particular culture.

Ethnic Identity

As the United States becomes more ethnically diverse, some minority groups will retain their culture and commitment to their group, while others may reject their group identity and acculturate to the dominant culture. Organizations are often interested in individuals who are similar to the employees currently employed at the organization, an approach in accordance to the Attraction-
Selection-Attrition model (ASA) (Schneider, 1987). The ASA model states that organizations would look for individuals who have acculturated to the dominant culture--assuming the organization reflects the dominant culture--while avoiding individuals who have not acculturated to the dominant culture. The ASA model would also predict that organizations would avoid these individuals by not hiring them, and exclude them from organizational functions, ironically, the very situations that would make them more effective. But by being aware of ethnic identity, organizations could develop diversity management tools that take ethnic identity into consideration.

Organizations may wonder 'what is ethnic identity?' Is it another word for ethnicity? Is it the same as social identity? Ethnic identity has been defined as a sense of belonging, commitment, knowledge about the group, involvement in traditions, and activities with the group (Phinney, 1990). Researchers have found ethnic identity important to study, because of its impact on psychological well-being. Ethnic identity is an aspect of social identity (Tajfel, 1981). An individual's social identity is important because it determines the person's outlook and knowledge of his or her group (Tajfel, 1981). Ethnic
identity is a set of ideals or ideas of one's knowledge and/or ownership of one's ethnic group. Factors within the organization can impact the development and maintenance of an individual's ethnic identity.

Studies have demonstrated that ethnic identity becomes more salient as a result of the increased conflict or perceived discrimination that sometimes occurs within affirmative action settings (Matheson, Warren, Foster and Painter, 2000; Rothbart and John, 1993). However, very few studies have examined the relationship between attitudes towards affirmative action and ethnic identity. One of the few studies that directly examined this relationship used Latino American undergraduate students and measured their attitudes towards affirmative action (Elizondo and Crosby, 2004). They found that Latino American students typically had positive attitudes towards affirmative action; that is, the more positive attitudes an individual had towards affirmative action the greater their ethnic identity. Another study using African American students found that more positive attitudes towards affirmative action were related to a higher level of ethnic identity (Schmerund, Sellers, Mueller, & Crosby, 2001). In general, research
has found a positive relationship between affirmative action attitudes and ethnic identity.

Self-Esteem

An individual’s self-esteem is how individuals evaluate or feel about themselves (Blascovich, & Tomaka, 1991). Self-esteem is an important aspect of an individual. Past research has demonstrated that it is critical for individuals to maintain a high level of self-esteem. Individuals with higher levels of self-esteem have been found to be less depressed (Russo, Green, & Knight, 1993) and have greater life satisfaction (Lachman, & Weaver, 1998). Employees with high levels of self-esteem are generally more satisfied and are better performers (Judge, & Bono, 2001). However, if an individual’s self-esteem is damaged or low, the individual will likely respond in a counterproductive way. To reduce the chance of a counterproductive workforce, it is critical that organizations should consider an employee’s self-esteem when implementing a new program or policy.

The policies and programs that organizations implement could possibly impact the individual’s self-system in a positive or negative way. Ultimately a program or policy
that is not implemented effectively could impact the employee’s self-system, which could lead to negative consequences such as conflict or foster anxiety that will lead to a decrease in overall role performance (Diamond, & Allcorn, 1986). Individuals will protect these aspects of the self-system when they feel that they are threatened.

Self-esteem has consistently shown a positive relationship with ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992; Umana-Taylor, 2004). Thus, individuals with high self-esteem will also feel good about themselves and other individuals of their ethnic group. The relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem has been demonstrated in African Americans and Latino Americans (French, 2003b; Phinney, Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997; Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994; Umana-Taylor, Diversi, & Fine, 2002). However, this relationship does not exist in European American samples (Umana-Taylor, 2004) and the lack of a relationship is expected since research has shown that ethnic identity is not as salient for European Americans (Phinney, DuPont, Espinosa, Revill, & Sanders, 1994). Phinney (1991) suggested that the relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem may be relative to an individual’s mainstream orientation (i.e., orientation to
the dominant culture). That is, Phinney (1991) found that this relationship exists when individuals possess both a strong ethnic identity and a positive mainstream orientation. However, when individuals are not assimilated or adapted to the mainstream culture, this relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem may cease to exist. Therefore, participants do not feel like members of the organizational culture, but rather as outsiders whose differences are highlighted and connected to their self-esteem.

How an individual's self-esteem functions within an environment depends on many factors. In diverse environments, individuals are often faced with many obstacles and barriers, which may change the way an individual feels about him or herself. Individuals with high self-esteem in a diverse environment are more likely to feel competent, and consider themselves a critical part of the work group (Pierce, & Gardner, 2004). These individuals are likely to be members of the majority group or the in-group who have traditionally been promoted and more recognized in work groups. In contrast, individuals with low self-esteem are more likely to feel useless, lack confidence in their abilities, and feel distant from the
work group (Pierce, & Gardner, 2004). These individuals with low self-esteem may be minorities who traditionally have had to deal with glass ceilings, discrimination, and lack of recognition. Diverse work environments are complex environments in which many variables may interact. One model, the information-processing model, attempts to examine the relationship between an environment and an individual’s self-esteem.

The information-processing model examines the relationship between self-esteem, executive self, and negative affectivity (Carver, & Scheier, 1990). Within this model, individuals examine the environment (workplace), evaluate their fit with the actual environment (dissimilar individuals) and the desired environment (similar individuals), and attempt to reduce any differences by reacting to the environment (conflict). Upon examining the environment, individuals evaluate their fit with the actual environment by examining their executive self (self-regulation, control strategies, and control beliefs). If individuals cannot change themselves or the environment to a better fit with themselves, the result is a reduction in the individual’s self-esteem, and possible relationship conflict. Therefore minorities in a
non-diverse work environment will examine the work environment, diversity programs, and upper-management’s ethnic composition as well as many other factors. If the individuals have a high level of ethnic identity, they will seek a work environment that supports that identity. If the work environment is incapable of supporting this type of environment it may lead to relationship conflict amongst the employees.

Previous research that examined the direct relationship between self-esteem and conflict has been inconsistent (Duffy, Shaw, & Stark, 2000). Studies have found both positive and negative relationships (Brockner, 1988). However, self-esteem has been found to be a mediator between job environment and organizational conflict. Brockner (1988), found that individuals with varying levels of self-esteem differed in their responses to conflict. Individuals with low self-esteem were more likely to experience work conflict (Brockner, 1988). Brockner (1988) posited three reasons why individuals with low self-esteem are more likely to experience conflict. Individuals with low self-esteem are more likely to second-guess themselves, and are often unsure of their actions; therefore, they tend to rely on social cues to make
decisions. Individuals with low self-esteem seek approval from their co-workers/supervisors and are more likely to adopt their attitudes or behaviors. Last, individuals with low self-esteem are more likely to blame themselves for negative feedback. This suggests that individuals with low self-esteem may either be less productive and more disruptive than an average employee.

Conflict

Work conflict has been defined as an employee’s awareness that incompatible differences in goals and desires exist amongst themselves (Boulding, 1963). Traditionally relationship, task, and process conflict have been identified as the three types of conflict (Jehn & Chatman, 2000). Relationship conflict is any personal or social disagreement unrelated to work. Task conflict is any form of disagreement over the work. Process conflict is any disagreement over assigned duties or resources. To determine a team’s conflict composition, all three forms of conflict must be examined simultaneously. Assessing all forms of conflict at once is referred to as proportional conflict composition (Jehn & Chatman, 2000). Propositional conflict composition suggests that different groups
experience different levels of the three forms of conflict. For example, high levels of task conflict and low levels of relationship and process conflict have been found to lead to an increase in job performance, because individuals discuss various ways to complete a task. However, when relationship or process conflicts are high, individuals are more likely to be distracted by the conflict, thus leading to lower performance. There are many possible combinations of the three forms of conflict, which could lead to various results. The various combinations and results may be related or affected by other variables within an organizational setting.

Previous Research on Conflict, Ethnic Identity, and Diversity

It has been well documented that diversity leads to various forms of conflict such as an increase in turnover, discrimination, and lower job performance (Aghazadeh, 2004; Jayne & Dipboye, 2004). Generally, organizational conflict focuses on the three forms of conflict; relationship, process, and task (Thatcher, Jehn, & Zanutto, 2003). Jehn and Chatman (2000) have found that individuals or groups could experience all three dimensions of
conflicts at various levels. African, Latino, and Asian Americans have been found to experience, in general, higher levels of conflict in organizations than do European Americans (Fox, & Stallworth, 2005). In particular, minorities in a diverse work environment are more likely to experience high levels of relationship conflict than process or task conflict (Garcia-Prieto, Bellard, & Schneider, 2003). Relationship conflict is linked to surface level diversity, which leads to an increase in discrimination, stereotypes, or other biases based on physical differences (Thatcher, Jehn, & Zanutto, 2003). On the other hand, deep level diversity has been linked to an increase in task conflict (Garcia-Prieto, Bellard, & Schneider, 2003).

According to the similarity-attraction theory, minorities may experience more conflict because they are less similar than the majority of employees. As a result, group members of the majority who are most similar to one another form in-groups and minorities who are least similar to the majority form an out-group (Thatcher, Jehn, & Zanutto, 2003). The creation of in and out groups increases the likelihood of conflict amongst the various groups.
Garcia-Prieto, et al., (2003) developed a model in which an individual's experience of diversity depends on the subjective importance that other individuals within a diverse work group give a particular social identity group. For example, in a homogenous racial work team, individuals within this team are less likely to focus on racial differences. However, in a heterogeneous racial work team, individuals are more likely to focus on racial differences. In a work group where a particular social identity is important, individuals will attempt to adopt that social identity and distance themselves from other social identities that are unacceptable (Turner, 1982). A salient social identity has been found to influence cognitive appraisal of issues through four dimensions: perception of goals, norms, control, power, and casual attributions (Garcia-Prieto, et al., 2003). A salient social identity determines which goals individuals perceive as important. Often the salient identity or in-group's goals are considered more important than any other group. Second, individuals take on the norms of the salient social identity group or in-group. Third, the in-group's perceived status difference in control and power with the out-group influences the perception of control and power.
Last, individuals in the group are more likely to attribute positive characteristics to the salient social identity or in-group and negative characteristics to the out-groups. The four cognitive dimensions support and build upon the similarity-attraction model. The differences between in-groups and out-groups in the four dimensions are crucial to the amount of conflict within the group.

Social identification within teams will lead some individuals to perceive out-group members’ goals as different and incompatible with their goals (Northcraft, Polzer, Neale, & Kramer, 1995). This conflict in goals could potentially lead some of the in-group members to attribute any existing conflict within a team to the out-group members. For example, team members are more likely to attribute positive events to in-group members and negative events to out-group members. If an in-group has more control and power than an out-group, any resulting conflict will appear less threatening, while the out-group members are more likely to feel anxious and powerless. Last, in-group member’s norms will be perceived to be more important than the out-groups norms. Conflict will likely result if the in-group’s norms are broken. Social identity has been demonstrated to play a critical part in the type
and severity of conflicts within diverse teams. However, ethnic identity as a sub-dimension of social identity has not been researched within the context of groups.

Current Study

The present study examined individual characteristics in a diverse environment that may lead to conflict. In particular, the present study examined how an individual's ethnic identity and self-esteem may mediate the relationship between a diverse work environment and conflict. Low levels of ethnic identity and self-esteem in a diverse environment may lead to higher levels of conflict.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between diversity and self-esteem. That is, the more diverse the work environment, the lower an individual's self esteem will be.

Hypothesis 2: It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between self-esteem and conflict. That is, low levels of self-esteem will be associated with high levels of conflict.
Hypothesis 3: It is expected that there will be a positive relationship between diversity and ethnic identity. That is, non-diverse work environments will increase the salience of one’s ethnicity.

Hypothesis 4: It is expected that there will be a positive relationship between ethnic identity and conflict.

Hypothesis 5: It is expected that there will be a positive relationship between diverse work environments and conflict. That is, the more diverse a work environment, the more conflict that will exist within that work environment.

Hypothesis 6: It is expected that there will be a positive relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem.

Hypothesis 7: It is expected that ethnic identity and self-esteem will mediate the relationship between diversity and conflict, thus decreasing their relationship.
Sample and Procedures

Participants

Participants were recruited from undergraduate psychology classes and various school districts' Human Resource departments located in Southern California. Participants completed an online survey that guaranteed their anonymity. Participants were able to log on to the Internet via any computer to complete the survey. One hundred ninety-six participants \((N = 196)\) logged onto the website containing the survey. A relatively large number of participants did not complete the survey. Specifically, there were 136 complete cases and 62 missing cases. Participants were 35% male, 55% female; 8% African American, .5% American Indian, 3% Asian American, 33% Caucasian/White, 20% Latino American, and 2% biracial/multiracial. All levels of positions, age groups, education level, and tenure length were well represented in this sample. See Tables 9 through 13.
Measures

Demographics Scale

A demographic scale was developed to collect personal information from the participants. The demographic data collected were ethnicity, race, age, gender, position, years with the organization, and years of experience.

Diversity Scale

The 44-item Climate for Diversity (CFD) scale was used to assess participant’s perceptions of their organization’s ability to manage, promote, and implement policies, procedures, and practices to attract, and maintain a diverse workforce (Nishii & Raver, 2003). The overall measure has an alpha reliability of .97.

CFD Subscales. The CFD measures five dimensions. The first dimension (organizational values) examined organizational values towards diversity or the extent to which an organization promotes the importance of attracting and maintaining a diverse workforce. The second dimension (organizational policies) examined organizational policies, practices, and procedures or the extent to which organizational policies and procedures are equally applied to individuals of all ethnic/racial, gender, and religious backgrounds. The third dimension (integration) examined
the formal and informal integration of nontraditional (e.g. minority employees) into organizational networks. The fourth dimension (relations) examined the inter-group and interpersonal relations or the extent to which, discrimination, preferential treatment, stereotypes, and conflict are minimized across employees of different backgrounds. The fifth dimension (organizational support) examined the organizational support for diversity by examining the amount of resources an organization is willing to contribute to diversity management.

These items were assessed on a six-point Likert-type format ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree. Higher values indicated that the candidates agreed with the item, while lower values indicated that the candidates disagreed with the item. Alpha reliabilities for this study for the full scale was .94 and for the subscales were as follows; organizational values = .90, organizational policies = .91, integration = .90, relations = .91, and organizational support = .92.

Self-Esteem Scale

The 10-item Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (SES) was used to measure self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965). Five of the items are positively worded, and five of the items are
negatively worded to avoid response bias. The overall measure had an alpha reliability range of .88. The SES measures global self-esteem commonly with a four-point Likert-type format (Strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree). After negatively worded items are reversed coded, scales score range from 10-40 with higher scores indicating higher self-esteem. Reliability for this study was .92 for the full scale.

**Self-Esteem Subscales.** Subscales were created for subsequent EQS analyses, based on a Principle Axis Factor Analysis (PAF). The first factor represented positive feelings; the second factor indicated negative feelings. Positive feelings had an alpha reliability of .92 and negative feelings had an alpha reliability of .91.

**Ethnic Identity Scale**

The 20-item Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (MEIM) was used to measure ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). The overall measure has a reported an alpha reliability of .90. The MEIM measures three dimensions of ethnic identity. Items are assessed using a 7-point scale from 1- disagree strongly to 7- agree strongly. If participants chose 1 "disagree strongly" consistently, they would score very low on ethnic identity or the subscale of interest, and if they
chose 7 "agree strongly" they would score very high on ethnic identity or the subscale of interest.

**MEIM Subscales.** The first subscale, ethnic behaviors, consists of two items (e.g., "I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs"). The ethnic behaviors measure assessed an individual's involvement and participation in traditional cultural practices. The second subscale, belonging and affirmation, has five items (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"). The second subscale assesses how proud and content an individual is with their particular ethnic background. The last subscale, ethnic identity achievement, has seven items (e.g., "I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me"). The last subscale assesses how well an individual identifies with his or her ethnicity. This scale ranges from an exploration stage to a commitment stage that is characterized by an individual's efforts to learn more about their ethnic background and by gaining an understanding of how their ethnicity is characterized within themselves.

Alpha reliabilities for this study for the full scale was .90 and its subscales were .92 for affirmation and
belonging, .92 for ethnic identity achievement, and .92 for ethnic behaviors.

Conflict Scale

The 8-item Intragroup Conflict Scale (ICS) was used to measure relationship conflict (Jehn, 1995). The reported alpha reliability for the task scale was .87 and .92 for the relationship scale. The scale measured both task and relationship conflict on a 5-point Likert-type format (anchored with "None" to "A lot"). The scale ranges from 10-40 with lower scores indicating higher levels of conflict.

Conflict Subscales. The first subscale, task conflict, consists of 4 items, (e.g. "To what extent are there differences of opinion in your work unit?"). This subscale measures the amount of conflict that is related to work tasks. The second subscale, emotional conflict, consists of 4 items, (e.g. "How much friction is there among members of your work unit?"). This subscale measures the amount of psychological distress an individual may experience within an organization. Higher scores indicated more task and emotional conflict within the workplace. Alpha reliabilities for this study for the full scale were .87.
and its subscales were .91 for emotional conflict and .91 for task conflict.
Overall Results

Univariate normality, outliers, linearity, and missing data were evaluated. The current data set had 62 missing cases (31%), 0 outliers, and the data appeared normal and linear. Multivariate kurtotic normality was checked through EQS using Mardia’s coefficient with a criterion of $z = 3.3$, $p < .001$; multivariate kurtotic normality was not normal ($z=8.03$) and robust statistical procedures were used in EQS. There was no evidence of multicollinearity in the data. The analysis was performed on the data from the 136 complete cases.

Prior to conducting the planned path analysis and mediation analysis, a series of Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to explore the relationship between the five climates for diversity dimensions, three ethnic identity dimensions, self-esteem, and conflict.

Hypothesis 1:

It was expected that there would be a negative relationship between climate for diversity (CFD) and self-esteem. That is, the more diverse the work climate the
lower an individual's self-esteem would be. In fact, we found that climate for diversity (composite scale) was positively related to the self-esteem composite variable ($r = .35, p < .01$). Therefore, the predicted hypothesis was not supported. See Table 5 for the full matrix of correlations.

**CFD Subscales.** Turning to the subscales of the CFD, organizational policies and practices showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem composite ($r = .37, p < .01$). Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem composite ($r = .26, p < .01$). Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem (composite scale) ($r = .38, p < .01$). Organizational values towards diversity were not statistically correlated with self-esteem (composite scale) ($r = .15, p > .01$). Organizational support for diversity was not statistically correlated with self-esteem (composite scale) ($r = .13, p > .01$).

**Self-Esteem Subscales.** Climate for diversity (composite scale) showed a positive, statistically
significant correlation with positive feelings \( r = .33, p < .001 \). Organizational policies and practices showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with positive feelings\( r = .39, p < .001 \). Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with positive feelings\( r = .21, p < .05 \). Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with positive feelings \( r = .35, p < .001 \).

Climate for diversity composite showed a negative, statistically significant correlation with negative feelings\( r = -.33, p < .001 \). Organizational policies and practices showed a negative, statistically significant correlation with negative feelings\( r = -.32, p < .001 \). Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a negative, statistically significant correlation with negative feelings \( r = -.26, p < .05 \). See table 5 for the correlational matrix of these scales.

**Hypothesis 2:**

It was expected that there would be a negative relationship between self-esteem and conflict. That is, low levels of self-esteem would be associated with high levels
of conflict. There was no significant relationship between self-esteem (composite scale) and conflict (composite scale) \((r = -.09, p > .05)\), in contrast to the predicted relationship. There were no significant relationships between any of the conflict subscales and self-esteem subscales. See table 4 for correlational matrix.

**Hypothesis 3:**

It was expected that there would be a positive relationship between diversity and ethnic identity. That is, non-diverse work environments would increase the salience of one's ethnicity, and in order to become a member of the in-group, individuals would lower their ethnic identity in order to fit in. In fact, we did not find a relationship between diversity and ethnic identity, thus providing no support for the hypothesis. See table 3 for correlational matrix.

**CFD and EI Subscales.** However, we did find several significant relationships among their subscales. Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a negative, statistically significant correlation with affirmation and belonging \((r = -.17, p < .05)\).

Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a negative, statistically significant correlation with ethnic...
identity achievement ($r = -.19, p < .05$). Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a negative, statistically significant correlation with ethnic behaviors ($r = -.28, p < .01$). Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees showed a negative, statistically significant correlation with ethnic behaviors ($r = -.24, p < .01$).

**Hypothesis 4:**

It was expected that there would be a positive relationship between ethnic identity and conflict. That is, the higher an individual’s ethnic identity, the more likely he or she would be a member of the out-group which may have lead to an increase in conflict. In contrast to the hypothesized relationship, we did not find a significant relationship between conflict (composite scale) and ethnic identity (composite) ($r = .12, p > .05$). However, we did find a single significant relationship among the subscale correlations. Ethnic behaviors showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with conflict ($r = .17, p < .05$). Because on the conflict scale a low number indicates high conflict, this result provides partial support for the hypothesis. See table 3 for correlational matrix.
Hypothesis 5:

It was expected that there would be a positive relationship between diverse work environments and conflict. That is, the more diverse a work environment, the more conflict would exist within that work environment. We found support for this hypothesis. Climate for diversity (composite) showed a statistically significant correlation with composite conflict ($r = -.50$, $p < .001$). Low scores on the conflict scales represent high conflict. See table 6 for correlational matrix.

Subscales. Organizational policies and practices showed a statistically significant correlation with composite conflict ($r = -.48$, $p < .001$). Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a statistically significant correlation with composite conflict ($r = -.51$, $p < .001$). Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees showed a statistically significant correlation with composite conflict ($r = -.33$, $p < .001$). Organizational values towards diversity showed a statistically significant correlation with composite conflict ($r = -.38$, $p < .001$). Organizational support for diversity showed a statistically significant correlation with composite conflict ($r = -.27$, $p < .001$).
Task Conflict Subscale. Climate for diversity composite showed a statistically significant correlation with task conflict ($r = -0.46$, $p < 0.001$). Organizational policies and practices showed a statistically significant correlation with task conflict ($r = -0.43$, $p < 0.001$). Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a statistically significant correlation with task conflict ($r = -0.47$, $p < 0.001$). Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees showed a statistically significant correlation with task conflict ($r = -0.30$, $p < 0.001$). Organizational values towards diversity showed a statistically significant correlation with task conflict ($r = -0.36$, $p < 0.001$). Organizational support for diversity showed a statistically significant correlation with task conflict ($r = -0.26$, $p < 0.001$).

Emotional Conflict Subscale. Climate for diversity composite showed a statistically significant correlation with emotional conflict ($r = -0.49$, $p < 0.001$). Organizational policies and practices showed a statistically significant correlation with emotional conflict ($r = -0.47$, $p < 0.001$). Minimization of discrimination and stereotypes showed a statistically significant correlation with emotional conflict ($r = -0.50$, $p$
Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees showed a statistically significant correlation with emotional conflict ($r = -0.33, p < 0.001$). Organizational values towards diversity showed a statistically significant correlation with emotional conflict ($r = -0.36, p < 0.001$). Organizational support for diversity showed a statistically significant correlation with emotional conflict ($r = -0.27, p < 0.001$).

**Hypothesis 6:**

It was expected that there would be a positive relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem. We did find a significant positive relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem ($r = 0.20, p < 0.05$). There was no significant relationship between self-esteem composite and ethnic identity achievement ($r = 0.15, p > 0.05$). Affirmation and belonging showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem composite ($r = 0.32, p < 0.01$). See table 2 for correlational matrix.

**EI with SE1 Subscale.** Ethnic identity composite showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem subscale 1 ($r = 0.32, p < 0.001$). Ethnic identity achievement showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem subscale 1 ($r = 0.32, p < 0.001$).
Ethnic behaviors showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem subscale 1 \( r = .17, p < .05 \). Affirmation and belonging showed a positive, statistically significant correlation with self-esteem subscale 1 \( r = .44, p < .001 \).

**Hypothesis 7:**

It was expected that ethnic identity and self-esteem would mediate the relationship between diversity and ethnic identity, thus decreasing the strength of their relationship. To test for mediation, four conditions must be met: 1) the independent variable and the mediator must be significantly correlated to each other; 2) the mediator and dependent variable must be correlated; 3) the independent variable and dependent variable must be correlated; and 4) the independent variable and dependent variable should not be related after controlling for the mediator.
In the case of ethnic identity, and using the composite variables of the constructs, the first two conditions are not met. CFD and EI are not correlated ($r=-.06$) nor are EI and conflict ($r=.12$). (CFD and conflict are significantly related, $r=-.50$.) The results of hierarchical regressions are shown in Table 8. As can be seen in the table, only the addition of CFD to the regression model significantly predicts conflict.

For self esteem, the first condition is met but not the second. CFD and SE are correlated ($r=.35$) but SE and conflict are not ($r=-.09$). When both variables are entered into a hierarchical regression model, the relationship of diversity and SE does not decrease, nor does the regression coefficient for SE change. The results of hierarchical regressions are shown in Table 7.

Path Analysis. These results for the mediation regressions were confirmed by a path analysis tested through EQS. The path model as diagrammed in Figure 1 had a poor fit to the data (CFI=.44) with no indirect effect found for CFD. Further, the post hoc fitting Lagrange Multiplier Test suggested adding a path between CFD and conflict ($\chi^2 = 31.33$, p<.001); rerunning the path
analysis with this path improved the CFI to .90, but again there was no indirect effect found for CFD on conflict.

**Structural Model.** Based on the strength of the correlational evidence for the subscales of the CFD, EI, and conflict, a SEM was conducted using EQS. See Figure 2. The independence model that tests the hypothesis that all variables are uncorrelated was significant, $\chi^2 (66, N = 136) = 770.09, p < .001$. A chi-square difference test was conducted in order to determine which of the two nested models was a better fit. The difference between the models resulted in $\chi^2 (50, N = 136) = 150.01, p < .001$. The hypothesized model was tested for fit. The comparative fit (CFI) Index was .86 and the root mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) was .12, which provide only minimal support for the model. A review of the Lagrange multiplier test and Wald test indicated no parameters that could be dropped to improve the fit of the model and the Lagrange multiplier test suggested adding a path between the measured variable affirming and belonging with the construct of self-esteem. This path was not added in an attempt to improve the fit index.

All of the measured variables links with their respective constructs were statistically significant. Half
of the path coefficients between the constructs in the model were significant. Climate for diversity significantly predicted self-esteem (unstandardized coefficient = -.44). For every one-unit decrease in climate for diversity, self-esteem increases by .44. Climate for diversity did not significantly predict ethnic identity (unstandardized coefficient = -.32). Ethnic identity did not significantly predict conflict (unstandardized coefficient = .17). Self-esteem significantly predicted conflict (unstandardized coefficient = .20). For every one-unit increase in self-esteem, conflict increases by .20. Overall, the predicted model was not supported.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Overall Goal

One of the main goals of the current study was to investigate the internal psychological states that occur within individuals in a diverse work environment that may lead to conflict. In particular the proposed model examined how a diverse workforce environment may increase or decrease the salience of an individual’s ethnic identity and self-esteem that in turn may increase or decrease the amount of conflict experienced within the organization. The proposed model was developed to assist us in gaining a better understanding of the cognitive and affective processes of employees within a diverse workforce.

Diversity and Self-Esteem

It was expected that there would be a negative relationship between diversity and self-esteem. Surprisingly, we found a significant positive relationship. Thus, the more diverse a work environment, the higher the levels of self-esteem amongst its employees. Previous research has found that majority members in a diverse work environment may be the beneficiaries of organizational
polices and practices, thus increasing their self-esteem (Pierce, & Gardner, 2004). In contrast, minorities in a diverse work environment may be faced with stereotypes, acts of discrimination, and glass ceilings that lower their self-esteem (Pierce, & Gardner, 2004). However, the positive relationship that we found between diversity and self-esteem suggests that majority members in this sample do not enjoy an unfair advantage over minority employees. In fact, our sample of minorities may not be experiencing blatant acts of discrimination, stereotypes, and glass ceilings on a frequent or regular basis. This finding may have been a result of the uniqueness of our sample and the location of the population from which it was drawn. The findings of an ANOVA comparing the self esteem by ethnicity supports this claim; no differences were found by ethnicity in self-esteem scale scores.

Our participants were drawn from Southern California, arguably one of the most diverse areas in the United States. It is not uncommon for most organizations within California to be diverse. Thus, it is highly likely that most Southern Californians work in a diverse organization with frequent interracial interactions. These organizations may or may not have traditional diversity
management programs, but it is highly likely that many of the extreme negative attributes found in non-diverse work environments are either non-existent or minimized through political correctness and/or a regular interaction of races/ethnicities inside and outside of the workplace. Past research has demonstrated that a racially heterogeneous workforce or population will increase interracial interactions (Fitzpatrick, & Hwang, 1992). Also with an increase in interracial interactions, past research has demonstrated that the importance of surface level differences (e.g. race, gender, age, etc.) will decrease, while the importance of deep-level differences will increase (e.g. personality) (Harrison, Price, & Gavin, 2002). Based on past research and the current findings, surface level differences (racial differences) may not be as important in Southern California. Therefore, increased interracial interaction in Southern California may boost an individual’s self-esteem, while decreasing an individual’s self-esteem in a non-diverse environment. With increased racial interactions and the increased importance of deep level differences it is more likely that stereotypes and discrimination will decrease, while other forms of conflict may be responsible for decreasing an individual’s self-
esteem (Allport, 1954). Future studies may want to test
this hypothesis by comparing the diverse Southern
Californian sample to a non-diverse urban sample.

Self-Esteem and Conflict

We expected lower levels of self-esteem to be
associated with higher levels of conflict. We did not find
a significant relationship between self-esteem and
conflict. Previous research that has examined this
relationship has been inconsistent; however, a few studies
have found that individuals with low self-esteem were more
likely to experience work conflict (Brockner, 1988).

According to the information-processing model these
individuals were unable to fit into their work environment
by changing themselves (Carver, & Scheier, 1990).
Unfortunately, we did not find a positive relationship that
would have suggested that our participants were able to fit
into their work environment. The lack of a relationship
suggests that the racial composition of our sample combined
with the location of our participants may have provided a
wide range of environmental adjustments already in
progress. Our participants from a Southern California
sample may contain a number of Caucasians who are the
minorities within their organization. As a result these
individuals may have to try to fit or assimilate into a minority-dominated organization. It is also highly likely that there are still many minorities who are also trying to fit or assimilate into a majority-dominated organization. However, it is more likely that a diverse work environment in California does not require majority or minority members to try to assimilate or fit into their work environment because the racial/ethnic composition may be very similar to the area in which they live. Therefore, we wouldn’t expect individuals to have a difficult time assimilating into their work environment. As a result, their self-esteem would be unchanged and it would not be directly related to conflict. To bolster this argument, an ANOVA comparing conflict scores by ethnicity revealed no differences across ethnicity in total, task or emotional conflict. Future studies should examine which variables when combined with self-esteem are strongly related to conflict.

Diversity and Ethnic Identity

It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between diversity and ethnic identity. Unfortunately we did not find a significant relationship between the composite variables of ethnic identity and
diversity. Surprisingly, we found a few negative relationships between some of the ethnic identity subscales and diversity subscales. Each finding will be examined individually.

In particular, we found that ethnic behaviors were negatively related to diversity (composite) or the more an individual participates in ethnic behaviors the less diverse the reported employee population within an organization. Ethnic behaviors were also negatively related to minimization of stereotypes and discrimination (diversity subscale 2) or the more ethnic behaviors an individual participates in the less likely an organization would attempt to minimize stereotypes and acts of discrimination. Last, we found that ethnic behaviors were negatively related to the formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees (diversity subscale 3) or the more an individual participates in ethnic behaviors the less likely the organization will attempt to formally and informally integrate nontraditional employees. Although these findings are in opposition of our hypothesis they suggest that less diverse organizations that do not have polices and procedures to integrate minority employees and reduce stereotypes and discrimination within the workplace
are indirectly encouraging ethnic behaviors either at the workplace or outside of the workplace. Our study did not assess the location of these behaviors. However, a minority employee who works for an organization that does not have a diversity program will not participate in ethnic behaviors at work but rather attempt to assimilate into the general work population. In particular our sample of Southern Californian minorities who work for non-diverse organizations may feel the need to increase their cultural participation outside of work. Therefore this finding suggests that a suppressive work environment will lead to an increase in ethnic behaviors outside of the workplace.

Ethnic identity achievement was negatively related to minimization of stereotypes and discrimination (diversity subscale 2). This suggests that individuals who highly identify with their ethnic group are more likely to work in organizations that do not minimize stereotypes and discrimination. Affirmation and belonging was negatively related to minimization of stereotypes and discrimination (diversity subscale 2). These findings suggest that an inhospitable work environment may lead an individual to develop a stronger sense of belonging and pride of their ethnic group. This reaction may be a defensive mechanism
that minority employees may use when their group is the target of acts of discrimination. Minority employees within this type of work environment may also band together developing a sense of belonging and commitment to one another to deal with the repressive work environment. This finding suggests that ethnic identity may be a reaction to work conditions. Future research should assess work conditions that may lead to changes within an individual's ethnic identity. An ANOVA comparing ethnic identity scores demonstrated a significant effect for ethnicity, thus indicating that ethnic identity did vary by ethnicity; European Whites reported lower levels of ethnic identity on all three subscales of the MEIM relative to the African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic participants in the sample.

Ethnic Identity and Conflict

It was expected that there would be a positive relationship between ethnic identity and conflict. Unfortunately we did not find a significant relationship. There are no previous studies that have assessed this relationship directly. However, using the similarity-attraction model we predicted that minorities with a strong ethnic identity (salient identity) might be less similar
with majority members, which may lead to conflict (Garcia-Prieto, et al., 2003). We predicted that individuals with strong ethnic identities would have different values, norms, practices, and cognitive appraisals that would lead to conflict. The lack of any significant relationship suggests that the majority and minority group members shared a similar salient social identity or that their identities were operating similarly within their working environments. Because there were differences in the measured ethnic identities using the MEIM, this latter explanation seems more tenable. This also suggests that surface level differences may not have been as important to our Southern Californian sample, thus reducing the importance of ethnic identity within the workplace. Conflict within the workplace may be related to deeper level differences such as personality differences rather than racial or ethnic differences. Future studies should examine which deeper level differences are related to conflict in a Southern California organization.

Diversity and Conflict

It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between a diverse work environment and conflict. We found strong relationships across the
composite variables and the subscales. The more diverse a work environment the more conflict reported within the work groups of the participants. This relationship was strongly supported and taken together with the ethnic identity data, suggests that conflict may not be the direct result of surface level differences, but rather deeper level differences such as culture, beliefs, and so forth.

**Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem**

We hypothesized a positive relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem. In fact we did find a significant positive relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem. Individuals with high levels of ethnic identity had higher levels of self-esteem. The confirmation of this hypothesis provides further evidence that our Southern California sample may be uniquely affected by their environments, but psychologically the same as other participants throughout the United States.

**Mediation**

The goal of this study was to determine if internal psychological states that exist within individuals in a diverse work environment would lead to conflict. In particular, we expected ethnic identity and self-esteem to mediate the relationship between diversity and ethnic
identity. Unfortunately, we did not find any evidence that ethnic identity and self-esteem mediated the relationship between diversity and conflict. This negative finding may have been the result for several reasons. First, the Southern Californian sample may have unique experiences as a result of the diverse environments in which they live and work. Therefore, diversity may not create the same individual internal psychological states as it would in a less-diverse work environment located in a less-diverse area. It is more likely that a deeper level variable (e.g. culture, beliefs, norms) in the Southern California sample (and expressed on the CFD measure) is creating the internal changes that may lead to conflict. Second, the inclusion of European American participants into the sample may have decreased the relationship. Within a diverse environment it is highly unlikely that European Americans would undergo the same internal psychological states, as a minority would experience. However, they may experience this in a minority-dominated organization. Third, it may have been more relevant to measure a more broadly defined social identity for this particular sample rather than ethnic identity. In a diverse environment and location, the importance of one’s ethnic identity may be replaced by
other distinguishing differences (position level, social status, and so forth). Fourth, it is quite possible that the racial or ethnic make-up of the participant’s organizations were racially/ethnically homogeneous, heterogeneous, or somewhere in between. The wide variety of work environments that could exist within Southern California may have created a dispersion of experiences and as a result it decreased the chances of finding a significant model.

Recommendations

Future studies should control the sample population by sampling from organizations that are diverse. This would reduce the possibility of including non-diverse organizations. It is also recommended that future studies exclude European Americans from the sample population. In addition it is recommended that a future study should compare the effects of diversity on a diverse work environment located in a non-diverse area to a diverse work environment located within a diverse area.
APPENDIX A

TABLES
Table 1

Correlations Between Ethnic Identity and Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CFD Composite</th>
<th>CFD 1</th>
<th>CFD 2</th>
<th>CFD 3</th>
<th>CFD 4</th>
<th>CFD 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Achievement</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Behaviors</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation and Belonging</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.

CFD 1 = Diversity polices and practices.

CFD 2 = Minimization of stereotypes and discrimination.

CFD 3 = Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees.

CFD 4 = Organizational values towards diversity.

CFD 5 = Organizational support for diversity.
Table 2

Correlations Between Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Esteem Composite</th>
<th>Positive Feelings</th>
<th>Negative Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation and Belonging</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.
Table 3

Correlations Between Ethnic Identity and Conflict For Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite Conflict</th>
<th>Task Conflict</th>
<th>Emotional Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Achievement</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Behaviors</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation and Belonging</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.
Table 4

**Correlations Between Self-Esteem and Conflict For Diversity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite Conflict</th>
<th>Task Conflict</th>
<th>Emotional Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Composite</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feelings</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.
Table 5

Correlations Between Diversity and Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Esteem Composite</th>
<th>Positive Feelings</th>
<th>Negative Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFD Composite</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Values</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Policies</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.

CFD 1 = Diversity polices and practices.
CFD 2 = Minimization of stereotypes and discrimination.
CFD 3 = Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees.
CFD 4 = Organizational values towards diversity.
CFD 5 = Organizational support for diversity.
### Table 6

**Correlations Between Diversity and Conflict For Diversity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite Conflict</th>
<th>Task Conflict</th>
<th>Emotional Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFD Composite</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Values</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Policies</td>
<td>-.51***</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.

CFD 1 = Diversity policies and practices.

CFD 2 = Minimization of stereotypes and discrimination.

CFD 3 = Formal and informal integration of nontraditional employees.

CFD 4 = Organizational values towards diversity.

CFD 5 = Organizational support for diversity.
Table 7

Regression Results for Conflict with CFD after Controlling for Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R^2 = .009 \) for step 1: \( \Delta R^2 = .144 \) for Step 2. \( N = 136 \). *\( p < .001 \)
Table 8

Regression Results for Conflict with CFD after Controlling for Ethnic Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R^2 = .015 \) for step 1: \( \Delta R^2 = .242 \) for Step 2. \( N = 136. \) *\( p < .001 \)
Table 9

*Ethnicity Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino American</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer/Refuse</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Age Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer/Refuse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

*Education Level Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer/Refuse</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12

**Position Level Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Level Executive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-Level Manager or Supervisor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Non-Management</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Non-Management</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Not Employed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time or Part-Time Student</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer/Refuse</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13  
Tenure Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer/Refuse</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIGURES
Figure 1
Proposed Model
APPENDIX C

SURVEY
Diversity Survey

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a study being conducted by Vincent Cordero under the direction of Dr. Janet Kottke for a graduate thesis. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Subcommittee of the California State University, San Bernardino, and a copy of the official Psychology IRB stamp of approval should appear somewhere on this consent form.

The purpose of this study is to investigate work conflict. Completion of the survey will take approximately 45 minutes.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study beyond those of everyday life, or any direct benefits for you as an individual. Results from this study will be reported in group format only so the confidentiality and anonymity of your data will be maintained. Results from this study will be available from Dr. Kottke (909-537-5585) after September 30, 2006.

Please read the following before indicating that you are willing to participate.

1. The study has been explained to me and I understand the explanation that has been given and what my participation will involve.

2. I understand that I am free to chose not to participate in this study without penalty, free to discontinue my participation in this study at any time and am free to choose not to answer any questions that make me uncomfortable.

3. I understand that no identifying information will be collected in this study that my responses will remain anonymous. I may request group results of this study.

4. I understand that, at my request, I can receive additional explanations of this study after my participation is completed.
Please do NOT put your name on this questionnaire.

Please place a check or an X in the space provided below to acknowledge that you are at least 18 years old and have read and understand the statements above. By marking the space below you give consent to participate voluntarily in this study.

Thank you.

Section 1

Instruction:
Please fill out blanks below.

Age____

Gender
Male___ Female___

Please chose your education level.
__ Some high school
__ High school graduate
__ Some college
__ College graduate
__ Graduate degree
__ Other (please specify)

Which category best describes your present work position?
__ Top level executive
__ Professional
__ Middle management
__ Entry-level manager or supervisor
__ Full time non-management/hourly employee
__ Part time non-management/hourly employee
__ Currently not employed
__ Full or part time student
__ Other (please specify)

Number of years working for your current organization..
Please read carefully each of the following statements regarding your organization of employment and select one level of agreement, which accurately expresses your level of agreement with each statement.

1. This organization values diversity.
2. This organization values all individuals, regardless of group identity.
3. This organization tolerates discrimination.
4. In this organization, people can be openly prejudiced without suffering any real consequences.
5. In this organization, minorities feel they have to act like the majority group to be valued.
6. In this organization, diversity issues are priority.
7. This organization values the contribution of all people, regardless of background.
8. In this organization, some groups are favored over others.
9. All individuals receive equal respect in this organization, regardless of group identity.
10. This organization does its best to accommodate the special needs of individuals.
11. Issues about race have been ignored by this organization.
12. Caucasian employees are considered the norm in which all other employees are compared.
13. Discrimination is a problem in this organization.
14. In this organization, racial minorities are likely to reach plateaus in their careers.
15. Certain minority groups are treated better than others.
16. Upper management is committed to promoting diversity.
17. In this organization, there are clear "in-groups" and "out-groups".
18. This organization has a commitment to hiring diverse employees.
19. Group identities never play a role in employee promotions.
20. In this organization, promotions are influenced by people's group identities.
21. In this organization, people can count on receiving a fair performance evaluation.
22. All individuals have an equal chance of being hired by this organization, regardless of group identity.
23. In this organization, some groups receive more pay increases than other groups.
24. In this organization, the performance evaluation process reflects people's performance accurately.
25. This organization is successful at retaining employees from diverse groups.
26. In this organization, some employees are part of an "inside track" for internal promotions, while others are not.
27. Informal social workers (i.e., people's personal friends at work) are often used to fill vacant positions within the organization.
28. In this organization, employees have a better chance of advancing if they are similar in social background to those responsible for making promotion decisions.
29. This organization attempts to actively seek out minority applicants.
30. It is difficult for minorities to be hired by this organization.
31. It is difficult for minorities to be promoted beyond a certain point (i.e., the "glass ceiling") in this organization.
32. This organization engages in discriminatory hiring practices.
33. Employees are not aware of any diversity-related activities.
34. Employees who file grievances are punished informally (i.e., they are not promoted; they are given more difficult work).
35. Minorities are given the same exact opportunities to succeed as non-minority group members.
36. In this organization, all individuals are able to achieve their full potential regardless of group identity.
37. This organization is taking the necessary steps to ensure that there is diversity in all ranks.
38. All employees are encouraged to engage in a mentoring relationship.
39. People tend to make friends only with others who share their group identity.
40. Racial minorities receive less support from their
supervisors than Caucasians in this organization.

41. In general, individuals in positions of power only help others whom they perceive to be similar to them.

42. Employees in this organization make derogatory remarks about race.

43. In this organization, people of different backgrounds work well together.

44. There are a large number of employees here who have prejudiced beliefs about race.

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, American Indian, Anglo-American, and White. Every person is born into an ethnic group, or sometimes two or more groups, but people differ on how important their ethnicity is to them, how they about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in:
In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be ______.

45. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

46. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.

47. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background what it means for me.

48. I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.

49. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.

50. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.

51. I sometimes feel it would be better if different ethnic groups didn’t mix together.

52. I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity in my life.

53. I often spend time with people from ethnic groups
other than my own.

54. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic group.

55. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.

56. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups.

57. To learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.

58. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments.

59. I don't try to become friends with people from other ethnic groups.

60. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music or customs.

61. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups.

62. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

63. I enjoy being around people from ethnic groups other than my own.

64. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

Below there is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

65. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

66. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

67. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

68. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

69. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

70. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

71. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

72. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

73. I certainly feel useless at times.

74. At times I think I am no good at all.
Below is a list of statements dealing with your perception of the amount of conflict that exists within your work unit.

Please use the following ranges below to indicate how much conflict you believe exists within your work unit.

75. How much friction is there among members of your work unit?
76. How much are personality conflicts evident in your work unit?
77. How much tension is there among members in your work unit?
78. How much emotional conflict is there among members in your work unit?
79. How often do people in your work unit disagree about opinions regarding the work being done?
80. How frequently are there conflicts about ideas in your work unit?
81. How much conflict about the work you do is there in your work unit?
82. To what extent are there differences of opinion in your work unit?

Debriefing statement

The study you have just completed was designed to investigate whether or not self-esteem and ethnic identity mediate the relationship between diversity and work conflict. In particular, we were interested how ethnic identity and self-esteem may increase or decrease the relationship between diversity and work conflict.

Thank you for your participation in this study. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact Dr. Janet Kottke, (909) 537-5585. If you would like to obtain a copy of the results of this study, please contact Dr. Janet Kottke, (909) 537-5585 after September 30, 2006.
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