

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) missing in number only; text follows. Page(s) were microfilmed as received.

138

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

A

**AFRICAN-AMERICAN BICULTURALISM, ETHNIC IDENTITY AND
ACCULTURATION DURING ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION**

by

PAMELA A. LIPP

**A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York.**

2001

UMI Number: 3008846

Copyright 2001 by
Lipp, Pamela Anne

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3008846

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2001

PAMELA A. LIPP


All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/3/01
Date


Chair of Examining Committee

4/3/01
Date


Executive Officer

Kay Deaux
Bill Cross
Walter Reichman
Joel Lefkowitz
Harold Goldstein

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERISTY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

AFRICAN-AMERICAN BICULTURALISM, ETHNIC IDENTITY AND ACCULTURATION DURING ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

by

Pamela A. Lipp

Advisor: Professor Kay Deaux

This study examined the relationship between ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism and the ways that African-Americans reduce uncertainty and seek information during the organizational socialization process. Established measures of ethnic identity and acculturation were used while the biculturalism measure was created specifically for the study. The biculturalism measure yielded two unidimensional scales labelled bounded and conflicted biculturalism. The bounded factor focuses on being conscious of one's behavior around white people and code switching. The conflicted factor deals with feeling pulled between work and one's social community.

Three types of uncertainty were examined: referent or uncertainty about tasks, appraisal, which is uncertainty about how one is performing the job and relational, which is uncertainty about personal relationships at work (Teboul, 1994). Seven information-seeking strategies were measured: overt tactics comprised of overt questions and covert tactics comprised of indirect questions, third parties, testing limits, disguising conversation, observation, and surveillance. The extent to which newcomers relied on supervisors, coworkers, direct reports, romantic partners, friends and family when seeking information was also measured.

Most of the 145 participants completed questionnaires on an Internet site, resulting in a well-educated sample representing a wide variety of industries and professions. Overall, the results indicate that ethnic identity and acculturation are related to very limited aspects of socialization and do not appear to have very much influence in the socialization process. Biculturalism is the best predictor of information seeking and source sought for information. It was the low scorers on the biculturalism measure, i.e., those who indicate little conflict and relatively low levels of codeswitching, who have adopted biculturalism as an effective strategy in successful socialization. Low scorers use more covert information seeking strategies, seek internal African American sources and seek more support outside the organization, from family and romantic partners. Moderator effects were found for perceived social costs. When those who are low in conflicted biculturalism perceive fewer social costs, they use more intraorganizational covert and overt information seeking and rely more heavily on intraorganizational sources. Theoretical and applied contributions and directions for future research are discussed.

Acknowledgements

The completion of a dissertation is a long and arduous process. There are many people who have helped me in this work that I would like to thank. I am indebted to Kay Deaux for becoming my chair and providing me with constant encouragement and direction. Her expertise and patient edits enhanced the quality of the study. Her understanding at my most vulnerable times and excitement at my happiest was invaluable. I would like to thank Walter Reichman for his insight and constant compassion for the human spirit. Bill Cross not only believed in my idea when I was about to give up, but was excited about it when I needed it most. Throughout my graduate school career, Joel Lefkowitz consistently provided me with thoughtful critiques of my work. I thank Harold Goldstein for his challenging questions that made me think even after my defense.

Margarita Almonte freely offered me her friendship from the day I met her as we began graduate school. I am grateful to her for her enthusiasm and sympathy as we shared phone calls, e-mails and meals!! I simply do not have the words to express my gratitude to Jill Hubley for the Dissertation Writing Plan, the tears, the late night ideas on the chalkboard and everything in between. Your support means the world to me.

To Mary McLoughlin, Pat Masia, Haydee von Sternberg, Noreen Axon, Julia Cornely, Gail Donovan and Elvira Ryder I offer my sincere thanks for their encouragement and prayers throughout the process. I also thank the CUNY Identity Research Seminar for suggestions and feedback on early drafts and ideas.

I am truly grateful to Liz Norris for all the days at work that she helped me refocus, calm down and have a better direction in what I needed to do. Thanks to Roger Millsap, Tracey Wilson, and Rob Turrisi for answering all of my desperate statistical questions so patiently.

Kaya Henderson supplied me with an endless stream of encouragement and empathy that helped me through the most difficult days. Her joy as I completed various steps helped to sustain me. I thank Kellie Richardson for understanding that sometimes I needed to talk about my dissertation and sometimes I needed not to talk about it. Her ability to make me laugh and allow me to clear my head helped me more times than I can count.

Finally I thank my family and boyfriend for their endless support of me. I am grateful to Jason for his patience as he made countless cups of tea while helping me talk through my disconnected thoughts to produce solid ideas. I thank my sister, Lori, for always being proud of me and for letting me know it. My thanks to my sister, MaryBeth, for editing the proposal while busy with her own studies. No acknowledgement list would be complete without thanking my parents. They have selflessly given me their bountiful love and constant support in all that I do. Their encouragement and belief in me has inspired me to produce this research of which I am proud.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| List of Tables | xi |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Identity Theory | 7 |
| Social Identity | 9 |
| Racial and Ethnic Identity | 12 |
| Racial Identity | 12 |
| Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity | 18 |
| Ethnic Identity | 20 |
| Acculturation and Biculturalism | 23 |
| Acculturation | 24 |
| Biculturalism | 26 |
| Summary | 29 |
| African Americans | 31 |
| Barriers to Advancement | 35 |
| Summary | 44 |
| Organizational Socialization | 45 |
| Stage Models | 45 |
| Seeking Information | 50 |
| Learning | 57 |
| Ethnic Groups | 57 |
| Biculturalism | 59 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Summary | 62 |
| The Present Study | 64 |
| Hypotheses | 67 |
| Uncertainty Reduction | 67 |
| Information-seeking Strategies | 68 |
| Sources | 69 |
| Perceived Social Costs | 70 |
| Learning | 71 |
| Method | 73 |
| Data Collection/Procedure | 73 |
| Participants | 76 |
| Measures | 79 |
| Results | 88 |
| Scale Properties | 88 |
| Test of Hypotheses | 101 |
| Summary of Results | 153 |
| Discussion | 157 |
| Ethnic Identity and Acculturation | 157 |
| Biculturalism | 157 |
| Organizational Socialization Information Seeking and Sources | 160 |
| Perceived Social Costs | 161 |
| Learning | 162 |
| Contributions | 162 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|
| Research Contributions | | 165 |
| Applied Contributions | | 166 |
| Alternate Variables | | 167 |
| Limitations | | 170 |
| Future Research | | 174 |
| Appendix A | | 177 |
| Appendix B | | 180 |
| Appendix C | | 181 |
| Appendix D | | 184 |
| Appendix E | | 186 |
| Appendix F | | 187 |
| Appendix G | | 191 |
| Appendix H | | 192 |
| Appendix I | | 194 |
| Appendix J | | 196 |
| Appendix K | | 198 |
| Appendix L | | 200 |
| Appendix M | | 201 |
| Appendix N | | 203 |
| References | | 207 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Communication Tactics | 51 |
| Participation Rates | 75 |
| Participants' Demographic Information | 77 |
| Factors of the African-American Acculturation Scale | 81 |
| Means, Standard Deviations, Range and Alpha Coefficients for | |
| Key Variables | 89 |
| Component Loadings for Bicultural Scale | 91 |
| Correlation Matrix of Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism and | |
| Internal and External Source of Information-Seeking | 94 |
| Correlation Table of Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, Social Costs and | |
| Specific Sources of Information-Seeking | 95 |
| Correlation Table of Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, and | |
| Intraorganizational Types of Information-Seeking | 97 |
| Correlation Table of Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, and | |
| Extraorganizational Types of Information-Seeking | 99 |
| Component Analysis of Key Variables in the Study | 102 |
| Hypothesis 1: Chi-square of Total Biculturalism Score and Uncertainty | |
| Reduction | 104 |
| Hypothesis 2: Correlation Matrix of Biculturalism and Covert Information- | |
| Seeking Strategies | 106 |
| Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Total Biculturalism and | |
| Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Information- | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Seeking Strategy | 114 |
| Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Total Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Intraorganizational Information- Seeking Strategy | 116 |
| Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Bounded Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Information- Seeking Strategy | 118 |
| Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Intraorganizational Information- Seeking Strategy | 120 |
| Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Information- Seeking Strategy | 122 |
| Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regressions Ethnic Identity/Exploration and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information- Seeking Strategy | 124 |
| Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regressions Affirmation/Acculturation and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information- Seeking Strategy | 125 |
| Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Total Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source | 127 |
| Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Bounded Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source | 130 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source | 133 |
| Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Ethnic Identity and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source | 140 |
| Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Exploration and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source | 142 |
| Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Affirmation and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source | 143 |
| Hypothesis 6: Correlation Matrix for Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, Social Support and Social Support at Work | 145 |
| Secondary Analysis: Backwards Regression of Biculturalism Level, Information-Seeking Strategy and Source on Learning | 150 |

Chapter 1

Introduction

Several incidents in recent years have given rise to an explosion of interest in the simmering issue of race relations in America. The harshest of these occurrences include the O.J. Simpson murder trial, the racial slurs caught on tape at Texaco, and finally the Rodney King beating and trial. The O.J. Simpson incident centered on a famous African-American football player who was charged with the murders of his ex-wife and her friend, both White Americans¹ (for an in-depth examination of this case, see Darden, 1996). Although many issues arose in this trial, a central theme was race: an African American, rich and who believed he had transcended racial lines, stood accused of killing two White Americans. Simpson's lawyer, Johnnie Cochran, played what has been termed the "race card," by making race a prominent issue in the trial. Many have argued that if race relations were less tenuous in this country, then Cochran's attempt to emphasize race would have failed.

Texaco made the headlines when multiple White, male executives were recorded using racial slurs about their African-American employees. Some of the executives who were caught were punished by the Board either by being fired or losing their retirement fund (see Roberts, 1998 for more detail). The Rodney King beating also has divided African and White Americans; King was an African-American motorist beaten by White American Los Angeles police officers. The beating was captured on videotape. Although many considered it a clear-cut case of police brutality,

¹ African American and Black as well as European American and White will be used interchangeably as deemed by the respective literature.

regardless of race, the outcome contradicted such a view. In a predominantly white suburb of Los Angeles, the officers were found not guilty of brutality. The verdict sparked racial riots in Los Angeles as well as a division between African Americans and White Americans in their view of the outcome.

These events have challenged Americans to re-evaluate what race and ethnicity mean to them. In addition, the effects of these occurrences are far reaching and impact our daily interactions at school, work and play.

Many people would like to, and some do, believe that the Texaco tapes exemplified racism of a few bad apples. The passing of racial epitaphs through e-mail at Morgan Stanley also stimulated a similar reaction: this was an isolated incident. However, numerous cases involving racial discrimination of either employees or customers have erupted all across the nation involving Denny's Restaurants, Circuit City and Publix Supermarkets (Aitcheson, 1997), suggesting that the problem is more widespread and institutionalized at the top. Racism is entrenched in the culture of many organizations whose elite leadership determines the culture, values and beliefs of their organization (Schein, 1992). Thus, the culture of the organization is really a reflection of the people who define it. In this light, organizations are microcosms of society.

The incidents at Texaco and Morgan Stanley remind us that racism, although often perceived to be quite atypical, is still a major problem in organizations. According to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the number of harassment and intimidation incidents based on race almost doubled between 1990 and 1998 from 3,600 to 6,500, respectively (Cox, 1999). Although there has been progress in the advancement of some African Americans, there are still many others who do not

succeed. In 1988, 5.6% of executives, managers and administrators were African American, a number that grew to 7.2% ten years later (Whigham-Desir & Clarke, 2000). Yet, as will be discussed below, many of these managers are concentrated in support areas, such as staffing.

Researchers have identified numerous obstacles that inhibit the development and advancement of African Americans. Repeatedly, researchers identify discrimination based on racism and prejudice as the greatest hurdle (Bell & Nkomo, 1994; Morrison, 1992). Other barriers include stereotypes (Bell & Nkomo, 1994), a hostile working environment (Morrison, 1992), inability to get a mentor (Morrison, 1992; DiTomaso, Thompson & Blake, 1988), presumed incompetence (Bell & Nkomo, 1994), lack of organizational savvy (Morrison, 1992; Thomas, 1990) and exclusion from informal networks (Friedman & Carter, 1993; DiTomaso, Thompson & Blake, 1988).

Little attention has been directed toward identifying the antecedents or factors that contribute to these barriers or specifying when they may be encountered during an individual's career. The literature on management development, which has been based on the experiences of White American males, indicates that organizational entry and socialization is a critical stage in an individual's career development (Wanous, 1992). During this entry period, supportive relationships are formed that later serve a pivotal role in providing access to developmental opportunities as well as exposure to key players in the organization (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). Despite the critical nature of organizational socialization, little empirical evidence exists about the process (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). Anecdotal evidence suggests that many, but not all, African Americans have difficulty forming supportive relationships during this critical period.

Exploring African-American ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism is one area that may help us illuminate these differences.

African Americans, often considered a monolithic group, are, in fact, very diverse. There are at least three ways to examine their diversity: ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism. Ethnic identity is a multidimensional construct that includes feelings of ethnic belonging and pride, a secure sense of group membership and positive attitudes towards one's ethnic group (Phinney, 1996; Tajfel, 1981). In essence, ethnic identity is how people feel about their ethnic group. For example, although an individual may accept membership in a particular group due to birth, another individual may not engage with the group except by name (Phinney, 1996). Others, however, may strongly identify with a particular ethnic group through beliefs, experiences and behaviors.

Acculturation is the process by which minority group members accept the values and norms of the dominant culture, while simultaneously stripping themselves of their parent culture (Phinney, 1990). Acculturated individuals have a weak identification with their ethnic group. Alternatively, biculturalism is the process by which minority group members learn how to function effectively in two cultures, adopting the values and norms of the culture one is in (Bell, 1990). In other words, bicultural people can move between cultural contexts, establishing alternative roles as necessary. Bicultural individuals maintain a strong ethnic group identity while still functioning effectively in the majority culture. One's degree of ethnic identity, acculturation and/or biculturalism may affect newcomer behavior in organizations. However, little research examining any of these constructs in a work-related context has been conducted.

A context in which to explore them is organizational socialization, a relatively new field of study, originally defined as the “process of learning the ropes” (Schein, 1968). Early organizational socialization research emphasized the passive newcomer. However, more recent research examines the newcomer as an active agent in the process (e.g., Louis, 1980; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Individuals who are successfully socialized into an organization are more committed to the organization and have low turnover intentions (Settoon & Adkins, 1994; Morrison, 1993b; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Jones 1986). The opposite is true for those who are not successfully socialized.

Previous research has suggested that when newcomers enter an organization, they actively seek to reduce uncertainty. These three types of uncertainty include the following: referent or task, which is uncertainty regarding how to perform a task and the role one should play while accomplishing the task; appraisal, which is uncertainty related to one’s behavior or job performance; and relational, which is uncertainty related to one’s social relationships at work and from whom newcomers garner information, advice and support (Teboul, 1994). To reduce uncertainty, newcomers use a variety of information-seeking strategies. Miller and Jablin (1991) have identified seven such strategies: overt tactics, indirect tactics, asking a third party, testing limits, disguising conversations, observation and surveillance. Research has produced equivocal results regarding whether or not newcomers prefer overt strategies (e.g., Comer, 1991) or more indirect strategies, like observation (e.g., Morrison, 1995). However, the preference for using internal and external sources by newcomers to seek information is clearer. Newcomers prefer to seek information from intraorganizational

sources, although this use increases over time because when newcomers first arrive in organizations, they do report using extraorganizational sources (Settoon & Adkins, 1994).

The dissertation is divided into 8 chapters. Chapter 2 is a review of a portion of the existing identity literature. To make the review manageable yet comprehensive, the identity literature that is germane to the study, social identity, is discussed. First I look broadly at social identity theory, followed by a discussion of one particular social identity: racial and ethnic identity. The status of African Americans in organizations is the focus of Chapter 3. Commonly researched barriers to advancement will be examined, followed by an exploration of ethnic identity in organizations as a potential barrier. Theory and research concerning the organizational socialization process is the focus of Chapter 4, where relevant models are reviewed. The discussion then turns to uncertainty reduction processes that occur during organizational socialization, including information-seeking strategies and sources that new hires engage during this transitional period.

The present study and hypotheses are outlined in Chapter 5. Relevant literature is summarized to outline the underlying rationale of the proposed study, and specific hypotheses are formulated. Chapter 6 describes the methodology utilized, including a description of measures, and chapter 7 describes the results and data analysis procedures. Finally, Chapter 8 is a discussion of the theoretical and practical contributions as well as suggested directions for future research.

Chapter 2

Identity Theory

Identity theories attempt to describe the various aspects of the self-concept. Sub-units of the self-concept (Demo & Hughes, 1990), identities can be defined as “meanings a person attributes to the self as an object in a social situation or social role,” (Burke, 1980, p.18). Although identity is integral to understanding the self-concept, the idea is difficult to define and often confused with the notion of the self (Gecas, 1982; Breakwell, 1988). Deaux (1992) describes the distinction between the concepts of self and identity as “somewhat equivocal,” arguing that the self “refers to a fairly abstract, global concept whereas identity is linked to specific aspects of self-definition” (p.10).

Identity has been studied from a variety of perspectives, including the following: the structure and process of identity (Breakwell, 1988), personal and social identity (Deaux 1992) and the relationship between them (Reid & Deaux, 1996), the organization of identities (Burke, 1980; Stryker, 1980), threats to identity (Breakwell, 1986; 1988), the multiplicity of identity (Thoits, 1983; Rosenberg & Gara, 1985), and possible selves (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Of these perspectives, Reid and Deaux (1996) assert that the distinction between personal and social identity has become an increasingly researched topic. Some of the more popular conceptualizations have been developed by Tajfel, Hogg and Abrams, Stryker and Cross.

One of the most popular conceptualizations of the difference between personal and social identity has been provided by Tajfel (1978) who has defined the distinction in the form of an interindividual-intergroup continuum, with personal identity representing one end and social identity representing the other. Hogg and Abrams

(1988) make the distinction between personal and social identity using a structural basis. They write, “social identities are self-descriptions deriving membership in social categories, while personal identities usually denote specific attributes of the individual and are essentially tied to and emerge from close and enduring personal relationships” (Hogg & Abrams, 1988, p. 25; cited in Deaux, 1992). For example, a social identity might be student, while a personal identity can be owner of dog M. A third conceptualization is by Stryker (1987) and other symbolic interactionists who believe a reciprocal relationship exists between role-identities and their interaction with society. These models emphasize identities based only on roles like intern or professor and exclude identities based on demographic attributes, such as ethnicity and gender (Deaux, 1992).

Finally, an interesting distinction was made by Cross (1987) who discussed the difference between personal identity and reference group orientation. Although Cross did not use the term social identity, the term “reference group orientation” is similar. Cross (1987, 1991) argued that personal identity includes those components that are universal to human behavior: self-esteem, self-worth, and general personality traits. Reference group orientation reflects differences in values, lifestyles and worldviews based on various group identities, particularly racial group. So while symbolic interactionists exclude membership in demographic groups as important to identity, Cross emphasizes its importance, particularly racial group membership.

Although personal identity has been studied extensively in psychology, social identity has received much less attention. However, the lack of research on social identity should not diminish its importance because our group memberships are affected

by our daily, numerous, social encounters. Garza and Herringer (1987) assert that the “nature of an interaction between two or more people, regardless of their relationships, is affected by their actual or perceived memberships in distinct groups” (p.300).

Following Cross’ (1987) definition of social identity, an important group to which people belong is their racial and/or ethnic group. Although it is an ascribed group based on birth, individuals may choose the extent to which they identify with the group. In order to discuss racial and ethnic group as a social identity, an overview of the broader social identity literature is necessary.

Social Identity

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) addresses the interactions that individuals, as representatives of groups, have with one another. Tajfel (1981) has defined social identity as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (sic., p.255). Thus, it is expected that an individual’s membership in particular groups will affect behavior during interactions with others. Tajfel (1981) argues that “it is impossible to imagine a social encounter between two people which will not be affected, at least to some minimal degree, by their mutual assignments of one another to a variety of social categories about which some general expectations concerning their characteristics and behavior exist in the minds of the interactants” (p. 240). Thus, our behavior is very much influenced by the groups not only to which we belong, but those to which we perceive others belong.

The assessments made by others about group memberships are affected by the groups to which people belong. Thus, it is important to understand how people's identities are constructed based on group membership. The numerous groups to which we belong impact our identity structure. According to Stryker (1987), the self is composed of numerous identities. These identities have been formed through interactions between the self and society. The individual will have as many identities as is necessary to sustain every group of social relationships. For example, an individual may have identities of spouse, parent and employee. Each of these identities requires different actions by the individual depending on the context of the interaction. The probability that the respective identity will manifest itself either within or across numerous situations, varying as a function of time and/or context is called the salience of an identity (Brewer, 1991; Deaux, 1989; 1996).

The self is comprised of identities that are organized into a salience hierarchy (Stryker, 1987), ordered by the probability of their functioning in various situations. Thus, based on situational context, people will categorize themselves and others into several social categories such as gender, age, or religious membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). The categorization allows the individual to organize the surrounding environment and locate him or herself within the social environment (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Ascribed group membership and social identity are not synonymous concepts. While an individual may belong to a group through either a voluntary or imposed nature, choosing the social identity of the group must be an active claim (Brewer, 1991). The acceptance of one's birth ethnicity has been referred to as self-identification

(Singh, 1977). A study assessing identity and perceived threat to that identity offers a salient example (Ethier & Deaux, 1990). The authors reported that of 45 students at two predominantly Anglo Universities, who were ascribed Hispanic group membership, 87% claimed Hispanic as an important identity, but 13% did not. Therefore, while others may perceive a person as Hispanic, not all individuals will self-identify with the Hispanic group or consider being Hispanic an important part of their identity. Further, Waters (1990) has offered examples of ethnic identity claims among European Americans. People are likely to label themselves members of one or two particular ethnic groups, when often there are multiple ethnic backgrounds in their family history. According to Waters, the primary factor people use in choosing how to claim their ethnic background centers on perceived status of their ethnicity. Waters suggests that the more recent the ethnic group's immigration, the more "ethnic" the group, and in turn, the more socially acceptable the identity. Therefore it is more likely the identity will be chosen. A secondary factor is choosing the father's ancestry, unless it is less socially desirable than the mother's is. For example, Waters found that those of Italian ancestry tend to claim it, while those of Scottish ancestry tend to ignore it because Italian is perceived to be more socially acceptable than Scottish. In fact, when measuring the popularity of Scottish ancestry, it fell from fourth place in 1926 to ninth place by 1977 (Waters, 1990). Many people will still not claim Scottish as their ancestry when Scottish is their father's background.

Although it is a growing topic, (e.g. Ethier & Deaux, 1990, 1994; Phinney, 1992) the self-identification of race and ethnicity has not been extensively studied. Usually, when race and ethnicity are studied, research emphasizes attitudes toward

groups other than one's own (Phinney, 1990). However, knowing how individuals identify with their racial and ethnic identity groups is important to our understanding of the psychological functioning of members of various racial and ethnic groups (Phinney, 1990). The strength with which people identify with their own racial and ethnic groups plus the positive evaluation of their groups may help individuals buffer the impact of racism and negative treatment that they often receive (Phinney, 1990).

Racial and Ethnic Identity

This section will examine the origins of the study of African-American racial identity and includes a detailed discussion of the racial identity development model proposed by William Cross. Next, a multidimensional model of racial identity proposed by Robert Sellers and his colleagues will be discussed. Finally, the discussion will explore the work of Jean Phinney, including her model of ethnic identity.

Racial Identity

The racial identity models were developed in the multicultural counseling field where there continues to be an interest by African Americans in exploring their experience based on their cultural reality (Myers et al., 1991). Two trends occurred in the development of Racial Identity Theory. The first of these is the Client-As-Problem (CAP) perspective, which focuses on the Black personality as universal and problematic (Helms, 1990). The second trend is the Nigrescence or Black Racial Identity Models. These models were developed with the recognition that Black identity develops as a response to racial oppression through the normal course of human development (Helms, 1990).

Client As Patient (CAP) Models. Many of the early models of racial development are referred to as deficit models because they concentrated on the presumed deficiencies of the Black personality. These models were introduced to help counselors identify which clients would be most problematic for a particular race of counselors. The CAP models focus on the client as the "problem." Most of the literature focused on White's fears that in general life situations Blacks would "act out their anger toward White society via passivity, mistrustfulness, and/or overt hostility" (Helms, 1990, p. 10).

Vontress provides one of the most inclusive of the CAP models (1971). According to Vontress, three types of Black people exist: Black, Colored and Negro. This typology depended on a self-classification system. Vontress writes:

Those who referred to themselves as 'Blacks' would value their African physical characteristics, understand the suffering inflicted upon their racial group, and would be intolerant of Whites who attempted to interact with Blacks from a racist stance. 'Coloreds' are Blacks who perceive and evaluate themselves as Whites do. Those who referred to themselves as 'Negroes' are integrationists who would accommodate Whites who were not blatantly racist (p.10).

This model was one of the first to address, although indirectly, healthy black development. It presented a radical position that assimilation into the Eurocentric society was not a prerequisite for the healthy adjustment of Blacks (Helms, 1990). More recently, Philogene (1999) has examined African Americans and the relationship between the ethnic label they choose and the attitudes towards that group. Philogene

suggests that those who label themselves African American have more positive attitudes towards their group than those who label themselves Black or Black Americans.²

Nigrescence Models. The Nigrescence models are models of adult identity development. Nigrescence is a French term meaning "the developmental process by which a person becomes Black" (Cross, 1994). Black has been defined in terms of "one's manner of thinking about oneself and one's reference groups rather than in terms of skin color per se" (Helms, 1990 p.17). Nigrescence theorists extend the CAP assertion that identification with white culture is not necessarily the baseline for healthy African-American development. Most of the models in this category are stage models, designating the least healthy stage as strong identification with white culture and the most healthy stage as racial transcendence. Various theorists have developed similar models (see Helms, 1990, for review), however, the most popular theory is that developed by Cross (1971, 1991).

Although his original stage model of racial identity development was popular, Cross revised it two decades later in response to a closer examination of some mid-twentieth century research and studies based on the earlier model. In his book, Shades of Black (1991)³, Cross reinterprets the classic studies by the husband and wife teams of Eugene and Ruth Horowitz and Mamie and Kenneth Clark. Based on their work, leading theorists of the time reported the psychology of African Americans as a "people

² Philogene (1999) examined the shift that has occurred in the perceptions and attitudes toward the group Black Americans. The latest name, African American, shifts the focus away from the previously used racially designated terms, "Colored," "Negro," and "Black" and emphasizes culture. Although the term was first introduced in 1989, one in three Black Americans prefers to self-identify with the name African American.

³ The discussion of Cross' model is based on his book.

of self-hatred.” However, upon closer examination of the original works, Cross determined that healthy levels of personal identity traits, such as self-esteem, could be found for African Americans both before and after the social movement of the 1960s.

Cross argues that one reason the Nigrescence models are so prevalent today is that most African Americans are educated in a heavily Eurocentric model. In this context, the role of African civilizations is usually ignored or misrepresented, leading to distortions in obtaining a true understanding of Black history and culture. The Nigrescence model is a model of re-socialization, stressing the preexisting identity that will be changed. The model does not apply to those who have been socialized to have a Black identity (Cross, 1991). Cross’ model consists of five stages (a) Pre-encounter, (b) Encounter, (c) Immersion-Emersion, (d) Internalization (e) Internalization-Commitment.

The first stage of the model is the Preencounter stage. Because Nigrescence is the process of becoming Black, the preexisting identity is non-Afrocentric. Behavior in this stage may range from low salience of Black identity to anti-Black sentiments. Many view their Blackness as a problem and consider their race to be a challenging stigma, fraught with oppression or discrimination. The second stage, Encounter, is a two-part process: the encounter must occur, and then the “world view” must be reinterpreted in light of these new feelings. Cross theorizes that a series of episodes culminate in one overwhelming event to spark a realization that the person’s “world view” needs to be reexamined. The individual realizes that no matter how much he or she may try to fit into the dominate culture, most Whites will always see a Black person. People are very confused during this vulnerable stage, as they transition from

their identity with the White world to an unstable and insecure Black identity (Helms, 1990).

When the person fully recognizes that a Black identity must be developed, he or she enters into the two-part Immersion-Emersion stage. First, people immerse themselves in what they think is Black culture and become very attracted to symbols they perceive to represent Blackness, such as hairstyles, clothes and national flags. Often behaviors exhibited during this stage are stereotypical because people in this stage do not have contact with the Black culture (Helms, 1990). After being immersed and experiencing the intense anger associated with this stage, people enter the second phase, called Emersion. Individuals realize that they can continue to grow positively in Blackness.

The next stage is Internalization. People in this stage vary in their emphasis on blackness. Some may be so immersed into their blackness that they believe Whites to be inferior and Blacks superior. Others may take on more of a bicultural stance by trying to incorporate both their American identity and their Black identity into their self-concept. Still others form a multicultural perspective and embrace interests from numerous cultures, often discussing plans of action to uplift the Black community. However, Cross stresses that these people are only open to the plans, not truly committed to implementing them. In the final stage of Internalization/Commitment, people are committed to work toward the advancement of all African Americans, not just a few. To work towards changing the community, the model suggests joining groups that actively work to eliminate racism, discrimination and oppression (Helms,

1990). The commitment aspect of this stage refers to interest in Black issues over extended periods of time.

The process of Nigresence was thought to happen only once in a person's lifetime. However, Parham (1989) has suggested that those who have undergone Nigresence at an earlier stage in life, such as young adulthood, may find or experience something that forces a re-examination of some of the stages. Parham refers to this concept as recycling. For example, these experiences may revert some individuals back to the Encounter phase where they need to redefine what Blackness means to them. It should also be noted that at each stage of the process, some individuals may remain stagnate while others may regress to an earlier identity.

Empirical Findings. Some empirical support has been found for the Nigresence models. For example, Whittler et al. (1991) found behavioral differences between Blacks with low identification and high identification with Black culture. Using a measure of Black culture developed specifically for their study, they found that people who highly identified with Black culture were more likely to participate in causes and activities involving the Black community. This group also reported having more Black than White associates, suggesting that those who undergo Nigresence and become Black both internalize and become committed to a plan of action, similar to behavior suggested by Cross's stages 4 and 5.

In a conceptual article, Parham and Austin (1994) looked at the Nigresence construct as a way of understanding career development attitudes and behaviors among African Americans. One area they considered closely was occupational distribution. Research shows (Hall and Post-Kammer, 1987; Bell & Nkomo, 1994) that African

Americans have been distributed largely into occupations that allow for helping others and working with people, while being underrepresented in areas like technology, mathematics, and science. Parham and Austin (1994) suggest that the construct of Nigresence may be useful in understanding this behavior because most career development theories discount the effects of race and gender.

However, empirical literature on racial identity in the area of career development has not supported Nigresence theory. One author examined the hypothesis that Black college students' racial identity attitudes would predict their intended entry into race-traditional occupations and majors, which are defined as those occupations with a high percentage of Blacks nationally (Wood, 1990). However, the author reported no significant relationships. In addition, Evans and Herr (1994) reported that racial identity attitudes were not a predictor of career aspirations among their sample of Black students at a predominantly White, northeastern university. These findings suggest that racial identity may not be a good predictor of career choice or aspirations or that the measure they used did not adequately capture racial identity.

Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity

More recently, Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley and Chavous (1998) developed a multidimensional model of racial identity (MMRI) of African Americans. Sellers and his colleagues attempt to integrate a sociohistorical approach to racial identity (e.g., Cross) with the more mainstream approach to racial/ethnic identity (e.g., Phinney). They argue that Phinney's approach provides a framework from which to examine African-American racial identity in the context of other identities, like gender, while Cross' approach provides a framework for examining the specific cultural and historical

context of African Americans. The sociohistorical context of the African-American group is essential to the MMRI.

There are four assumptions of the MMRI. The first is that identities are stable properties of the person that are situationally influenced. The second is that people hierarchically order their identities so that the importance an individual places on racial identity can be examined. The third assumption is that the individuals' perception of his or her racial identity provides "the most valid indicator of [his or her] identity" (p.23). Thus, the way the individual has chosen to construct his or her own identity is key to understanding how that identity plays out. The last assumption is that there is no definition of what it means to be Black, nor is there an evaluation of an individual's perception of what it means to be Black.

Four dimensions comprise the MMRI: salience, centrality, regard and ideology. Salience is the extent to which race is part of the self-concept in a particular situation. Centrality is stable across situations and refers to the way a person normatively defines him-or herself with regard to race. For example, being the only African American in a certain context, such as work or a waiting room may make race salient to some African Americans. However, the stable person characteristics, or centrality, of some people may not make race salient. Although race has been assumed to be a central aspect to the African-American self, empirical research has not always supported this assumption (Sellers et al, 1998).

Racial regard is an individual's affective and evaluative judgment of race. Based on Crocker and Luhtanen's (1990, Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) work on collective self-esteem, racial regard has both public and private dimensions. Private

regard is the extent to which individuals feel positively or negatively toward African Americans as a group and how they feel about being African American. Public regard is the extent to which individuals feel that others view African Americans positively or negatively.

The ideology dimension of the MMRI refers to the philosophy by which African Americans interact with society. Four types of philosophies comprise the ideology dimension of racial identity: assimilation, oppressed minority, humanist and nationalist. These ideologies can be demonstrated in four areas: political/economic development, cultural/social activities, intergroup relations and perceptions of the dominant group.

Both the Cross and Sellers racial identity models emphasize the specific racial group context of African Americans. Phinney has developed a model that focuses on the similar components of ethnic identity development across various groups.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity is just one of the many social identities an individual may possess and varies as a function of the individual. It is a multidimensional construct that includes feelings of ethnic belonging and pride, a secure sense of group membership and positive attitudes towards one's ethnic groups (Phinney, 1996). The importance of ethnic identity to minorities has been established in the literature (Phinney, 1996; Phinney, 1993; Phinney and Alipuria, 1990; Aries and Moorehead, 1989; Garza and Herringer, 1987). For example, Phinney and Alipuria (1990) surveyed 196 Asian American, Black, Hispanic, and White students who were enrolled in an ethnically diverse, urban university. Participants responded to questions about how much they explored ethnic issues, resolved those issues, and how they perceived the

importance of ethnicity as an area of identity. Two-thirds of Asian-American, Black and Mexican-American college students rated ethnicity as quite or very important to their identity, compared with only one-quarter of the White students.

Another frequently researched topic is the developmental process of ethnic identity. Phinney recognized that a model to examine ethnic identity development, regardless of specific group, did not exist. Based on the work of Cross who studied African Americans, Kim who studied Asian American females, Atkinson who studied minorities, and Marcia who studied adolescent development, Phinney (1993) created a developmental process model of ethnic identity. In her model, she conceptualizes ethnic identity development as a continuum including (a) Unexamined Ethnic Identity (b) Ethnic Identity Search/Moratorium and (c) Ethnic Identity Achievement. The focus of Unexamined Ethnic Identity, is the lack of exploration of ethnic identity. In this stage, minorities accept the values and attitudes of the majority culture. Kim found two types of identification with White values: active and passive. Those who actively identified with white values considered themselves to be very similar to their White peers. Those who passively identified with whites did not consider themselves to be white, yet seemed to share the “acceptance of white values, beliefs and standards” (Phinney, 1993, p.66). However, Phinney argues that just because one is in identity foreclosure or merely accepting values and opinions of others, does not necessarily mean that the individual wants to be White.

The second step, Ethnic identity Search/Moratorium, focuses on searching for the meaning of ethnic identity. Past models have labeled this stage differently, but have consistently included it. During this stage, adolescents engage in activities such as

talking with family, visiting ethnic museums and reading books about their ethnic group (Phinney and Tarver, 1988). Also during this time, some may experience anger and outrage toward the white society as oppressors (Phinney, 1993). Those in Ethnic Identity Achievement, the endpoint, have successfully reached identity achievement as the name implies. In this stage, people are proud to be in their ethnic group. Although they know the term ethnicity confused them in the past, they are now happy with their ethnicity (Phinney, 1993).

Empirical Findings. In an extensive review of the ethnic identity research, Phinney (1990) reported that a variety of researchers have looked at ethnic identity from the perspective of specific cultures and their customs, although in many cases items pertaining to African-American identity have been ignored. For example, Phinney found the most frequently measured indicator of ethnic identity was language, although Black English was not included. Another important measure is the number of friendships with in-group members, although few studies involving Blacks measure this either. Religious affiliation was measured for White ethnic groups, Hispanic groups and from one Jewish group, but not for Blacks and Asians. Structured ethnic social groups, or belonging to groups representative of one's ethnicity, were used for Whites, Asians and Hispanics, but not in any studies examining Black identity. Finally, political ideology and activity was measured focusing disproportionately on Blacks and only in one study involving Mexican-Americans. Area of residence has also been measured, but not in any studies regarding Blacks.

The most studied outcome of this paradigm is that of a poor self-concept or low self-esteem that will lead to a negative social or ethnic identity. Although it is

hypothesized that ethnic minority status has a direct and negative impact on self-esteem, empirical studies have not generally supported this assumption (Phinney, 1992). For example, Phinney, Chavira & Tate (1993) found that in their sample of Hispanic teenagers, those who received a threat to identity through exposure to negative images of the Hispanic group rated Hispanics as a group lower. However, it did not affect their ethnic self-concept. Those with a strong sense of ethnic identity tended to have a positive view of themselves members of the Hispanic group.

In an attempt to understand why ethnic minority status may not negatively affect self-esteem, Crocker and Major (1989) considered three ways that belonging to a stigmatized group might protect the self-concept. First, those in stigmatized groups may attribute negative feedback to prejudiced attitudes of others, called external attribution, when the context allows for such attribution. Secondly, members may choose to make in-group comparisons rather than compare themselves to the out-group. Finally, members of stigmatized groups may selectively choose to devalue the importance of dimensions on which their group does not succeed or prosper, while selectively valuing areas in which their group thrives (Crocker & Major, 1989). Two other approaches to examine African-American diversity are the related processes of acculturation and biculturalism.

Acculturation and Biculturalism

Racial and ethnic identity have been studied within the framework of acculturation and biculturalism (Phinney, 1990). Many people choose to simplify their ethnic identity by claiming one group, while some choose to identify strongly with two different groups (Tajfel, 1978). Usually one of the two groups is an ethnic group, while

the other group is that of the majority. The individual may experience a conflict in attitudes, values and behaviors, depending on the attitudes, values and behaviors of the respective groups. The individual will either choose one of the identities over the other or attempt to form a bicultural identity. In choosing one identity over the other, the individual may choose to identify strongly with the minority group resulting in a traditional identity or with the majority group, resulting in acculturation. Biculturalism is the process by which minority group members learn how to function effectively in two cultures, adopting the values and norms of the respective culture in which one is operating (Bell, 1990). In other words, bicultural individuals can move between cultural contexts establishing alternative roles as necessary.

Acculturation

When two or more ethnic groups exist together over a period of time, ethnic identity tends to become salient. Sometimes, as mentioned above, members of ethnic groups, choose their ethnic background based on the perceived status of the ethnicity (Waters, 1990). Alternatively, they may choose acculturation, which is to emphasize the importance of the majority group and downplay the importance of their ethnic group. According to Berry, Trimle and Olmedo (1986), acculturation is the process of changes in attitudes, values and behaviors that occur when two distinct cultures are in contact with each other (Phinney, 1990).

In acculturation, although both cultures may have mutual influence, often it is the majority culture that influences the minority culture. The choice of acculturation is inevitable because the majority and minority cultures are tied together in the social

structure of the society. Thus, decisions are made with regard to both preserving the culture of origin and interacting with the majority group.

The relationship between ethnic identity and degree of acculturation is unclear. Phinney argues that it is equivocal (1990, p.508). However, Landrine and Klonoff (1994) argue that racial identity and acculturation are independent, orthogonal constructs. They assert that one's behavior based on cultural practices indicates nothing about one's attitudes towards or feelings about belonging to their racial group.

Two types of models have been developed within the acculturation perspective (Phinney, 1990): a linear, bipolar model and a multilinear model. The linear, bipolar model portrays a continuum from strong ethnic ties to strong mainstream ties, in which the strengthening of one implies a weakening of the other (Phinney, 1990; Andujo, 1988). The multilinear model proposes that the relationship with the ethnic culture should be considered in addition to the relationship with the dominant culture, and the two relationships may be separate from one another.

Landrine and Klonoff (1994) developed a measure of African-American acculturation. They searched the literature and selected eight dimensions they felt accurately described African-American culture and created items based on those dimensions. The scale was constructed so that high scores equal a traditional African-American orientation, moderate scores indicate a bicultural orientation and low scores indicate an acculturated orientation. The items are rated using a Likert-type 7-point agreement scale. A problem with this scale is in its conceptualization. The scale was developed to measure 3 separate constructs with the same set of items on the continuum. Indicating degree of agreement on each item and then calculating a total

score does not indicate a traditional, bicultural, or acculturated orientation. The scale is unidimensional, measuring degree of acculturation, which is what the authors originally intended when they created the scale. The traditional view of biculturalism is to treat it as a stage between a traditional orientation and an acculturated orientation (e.g., Landrine & Klonoff). A contrasting position, which will be considered in this study, is to conceptualize biculturalism as a strategy whereby people learn to respond effectively to two different cultures.

Biculturalism

Some ethnic group members choose to maintain the importance of their ethnic origin while also functioning effectively in the mainstream culture. These people are choosing to develop a bicultural identity. Based on a review of the bicultural literature, LaFromboise and her colleagues identify areas one must master in order to be biculturally competent (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1994). Some of these areas include: (a) knowledge of cultural beliefs and values, (b) communication ability, (c) a sense of being grounded and (d) bicultural efficacy. A knowledge of cultural beliefs and values implies that an individual is aware of the various rituals, histories and mores of a particular culture and participates in these as necessary for acceptable interaction. Communication ability refers to an individual's capability to effectively communicate, both verbally and nonverbally, his or her ideas and feelings to members of either culture. More than merely learning the language, this component refers to learning the dominant or new language as well as maintaining the primary language (e.g. code switching). Social support or groundedness is also viewed necessary for bicultural

competency. For true effectiveness, social support needs to be established in both cultures.

Finally, bicultural efficacy is the “belief...that one can live effectively, and in a satisfying manner, within two groups without comprising one’s sense of cultural identity” (p. 404; LaFromboise, et al., 1994). Their hypothesis, based on Bandura’s self-efficacy work, is that the more individuals believe they can achieve something, the more likely they are to achieve it. Thus, the more an individual believes he or she can achieve bicultural efficacy, the more likely he or she will. Adding support to this theory, Berry et al (1987) reported that those who seek integration feel minimal stress. In addition, other research has found that those who are effectively bicultural exhibit more “behavioral flexibility and multicultural skills” than those who are not (Garza & Romero, 1982, p.239).

Yet some groups who choose to acculturate may be more easily accepted by the majority system than others groups who have a lower rank in the prejudice system (Berry, 1992). African Americans are fairly low in the prejudice system in the United States. Thus, living a bicultural life may not be as easy as feeling one can achieve it (Bell, 1990; Denton, 1990). According to Bell (1990), whose research focuses on black women, the bicultural life experience can be a source of empowerment as well as psychological distress. Denton (1990) reported that some black women form supportive bonds with other black women who provide them with emotional support in the face of bicultural stress. Using the same sample, Bell (1990) reported that some women compartmentalize their life contexts to deal with bicultural stress, creating a sharp division between their work lives in a white context and their personal lives in a

black context. Those who compartmentalize thoroughly will never experience any overlap in these two areas of their lives. As mentioned above, not everyone who leads a bicultural life experiences it with ease. Although they may be effectively bicultural, it is not without stress.

Ford, Harris and Schuerger (1993) have proposed a method for individuals to resolve the potential conflict between two cultures. Although the model is based in a school context, it may be applicable to a work context where the majority is White. Members of the Black community who work or go to school with Whites, often do not want to be perceived as “selling out” or “acting White” (Ford et al., 1993; Fordham, 1988). Fordham (1988) argues that if high-achieving Black students desire to succeed in academia, they must develop a “raceless persona” achieved by emptying themselves of their culture and adopting characteristics of the dominant culture (Fordham, 1988; Ford et al., 1993). Fordham argues, “[o]ut of their desire to secure jobs and positions that are above the employment ceiling typically placed on Blacks, they have adopted personae that indicate a lack of identification with, or a strong relationship to, the Black community in response to an implicit institutional mandate: Become ‘un-black’” (p.58). With the onset of this racelessness may come the rejection by the Black community. These students are rejected not because of their success, but because of their detachment from the community (Ford et al., 1993).

Conflicts of this type may also arise for Black employees who work in predominantly White organizations. Using the framework of social identity theory, James and Khoo (1991) attempted to describe the situations that minorities face when they enter organizations dominated by European Americans. Macrolevel and

microlevel factors such as culture, history and the situational context influence how an individual relates to both the in-group and out-group (James & Khoo, 1991). When minority group identity is important to a person, either anticipated or real isolation from other group members may prevent some minorities from seeking or continuing employment in such contexts. Studies by both Dickens and Dickens (1982) and Boardman, Harrington and Horowitz (1982) found that both African-Americans and women have increased feelings of isolation with greater success.

Blacks must find a way to deal with the conflicts that may exist between their two worlds. Some try to leave their two worlds separate, while others allow them to collide and deal with the outcomes (Bell, 1990). Although Fordham (1988) asserts that children take on a raceless persona in an attempt to deal with conflict at school, these may be merely outward behaviors that one uses to cope with the situation at hand. In other words, the behaviors displayed may not necessarily be indicative of a person's identity, but rather, of the coping mechanism the person has developed.

Summary

Three ways of examining African-American diversity were suggested: ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism. Both Cross' and Sellers' models of racial identity are limited in that they are specific to one group, African Americans. However, Phinney's model offers a general model of ethnic identity development and a potential framework for discussing similarities and differences in the ethnic identity development process across groups. In addition, Phinney's measure is one of the most commonly used in this area. At the time of this research, measures for both the Cross and Sellers approaches to racial identity were unavailable.

Acculturated individuals have adopted mainstream norms and values, believe that the majority culture is superior to the minority culture and have chosen to acquire as much of the culture as possible (LaFromboise et al., 1994). Those who have chosen a bicultural lifestyle have opted to maintain the importance of two cultures in their lives. Effectively bicultural individuals work towards having social support in both cultures.

Chapter 3

African Americans

Recent court cases involving racism in multimillion dollar corporations have spurred new debate about racism and its effect on minority workers in corporate America. In 1996, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) received more than 26,000 complaints of racial discrimination against employees in the private sector (Weathers, 1997). There have been some highly profiled companies that have either settled out of court or lost their cases. In addition to the landmark Texaco case, Denny's Restaurant, owned by Flagstar Corporation, settled two class-action lawsuits for \$46 million; the company also committed \$1 billion to the hiring of minorities (Aitcheson, 1997). There have also been charges of discrimination in promotion practices; a jury awarded two African-American employees \$300,000 because they were passed over for promotion by Circuit City. Publix Supermarkets Inc. agreed to a settlement of \$3.5 million with the EEOC after African Americans charged they were systematically denied promotions, raises and preferred assignments. This settlement came after an \$81.5 million settlement, in which a class-action suit of 100,000 women charged systemic gender discrimination (Aitcheson, 1997). Although these suits exemplify a systematic problem in corporate America, they tell only a limited part of the story. The consequences of discrimination can be very detrimental to the organization, for example, turnover costs of managerial employees range between 150 and 193 percent of a manager's annual salary (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995).

In the 1990 Census, African Americans accounted for approximately 12 percent of the population and approximately 10 percent of the workforce in the United States

yet, represented only 7 percent of all managerial positions (Clark, 1997). However, the percentage of African Americans holding management positions may be misleading. According to a report by the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, the majority of African-American males and females work in the public sector and in non-governmental agencies such as social welfare, education, museums and health (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). Once an industry is concentrated with large numbers of a particular group, then group membership may be an effective predictor of status within the industry (Bell & Nkomo, 1994). More specifically, once African Americans are concentrated in a specific industry, such as human resources, they should be more likely to attain managerial or executive positions. For example, in industries with a greater number of African Americans like personnel, labor relations and vocational and educational counseling (Bell & Nkomo, 1994), African Americans have attained greater hierarchical success; yet their lack of advancement in the hierarchy still exists strongly in fields such as accounting and design. With increased success based on greater numbers, advancement should not be dependent on concentration of a particular group within a given field, but rather the performance-based merits of an individual. Thus, African Americans holding managerial positions may be concentrated in certain areas, rather than represented across various industries.

In addition, African-Americans with professional degrees earn significantly less than white males. African-American men earn 79 percent of that earned by European-American males while African-American women earn 60 percent of what European American men earn (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). There are also significant gender differences in employment patterns of African Americans. African-American

professional women surpass African-American professional men by a two to one margin, yet at the most senior levels African-American men outnumber African-American women (Tucker, 1994). Further, although women hold 42 percent of all management and executive positions, White women (Bell & Nkomo, 1994) hold 97 percent of these positions. Minority women who include Latina, Asian and African-American women hold the remaining three percent.

To determine how companies were moving minorities into the senior ranks, Korn Ferry International, a recruiting firm, conducted surveys of the Fortune 1,000 companies in both 1979 and 1985 (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Jones 1986). Of 1,708 senior executives in the first survey, .18 percent were Black, .12 percent were Asian, .12 percent were Hispanic and .47 percent were female. In the second survey, of 1,362 senior executives .29 percent were reported Black, .44 percent were Asian, .22 were Hispanic and 2.13 percent were women. Jones (1986) writes, "I think it's fair to say that this is almost no progress at all" (p.84). Another example of the stagnant progress is the faculty at Harvard Law School. Derrick Bell became the first tenured Black professor at the school in 1971. Six years later he threatened to leave the school if more Black faculty were not hired (Williams, 1987). Bell was quoted as saying, "Now out of a faculty of about 70 or 80, we have two tenured Black professors, two Blacks who are in line for tenure and two visiting professors who are Black...It's nothing to boast about but it's better" (1987, p. A 16).

The 1990s have brought progress because some African Americans are rising to the top levels in organizations, however there are still some African Americans who still report being either the first and/or only in their respective areas. For example,

Margaret Jordan of Southern California Edison was the first female and first black executive at her level in the company. She says, "The CEO deliberately wanted me to come on board in part because he wanted to get more color within his executive ranks. He's fairly up-front about that (Tucker, 1994, p.61). Ella Bell discussed her role at MIT, where she was one of 3 African-American women faculty out of 965. Bell writes, "When you're in the solo role, you're up against all the stereotypes, while you're also trying to create new images of what it means to be black and female. Black women are like a black screen where people are constantly projecting different images on you, most of which may be totally unrecognizable. That throws you off balance. So you must remain anchored and know who you are" (Tucker, 1994, p.61). Linda Baker Keene of Grand Metropolitan PLC talked of attending a company meeting of the top 200 managers worldwide. She recounts, "It took my breath away to go into a meeting of the most senior levels in my corporation and realize that I was the only black person at this level. No one ever stopped to think that this might be uncomfortable or a difficult situation. It's not an issue for them. You just have to learn how to deal with it. But I don't think you ever stop being uncomfortable" (Tucker, 1994, p.61).

By 1993, there were two Black CEOs of major companies: Richard Parsons of the Dime Savings Bank and Clifton R. Wharton, Jr. of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA-CREF), but none in any of the Fortune 500 companies (Branch, 1993). Finally, in May 1998, Franklin Raines, a former White House budget director, was named CEO of Fannie Mae (Johnson, 1998),

currently 26 on the Fortune 500 list⁴. Five other African-American CEOs have been identified from the 1,000 largest publicly traded companies in the U.S. (Whigham-Desir & Clarke, 2000). A. Barry Rand of Avis Rent A Car and Lloyd D. Ward of Maytag are the only two to head Fortune 500 companies numbers 465 and 368, respectively. Ken Chenault, President and COO of American Express, number 71 on the Fortune 500 list, became CEO in 2001 (Hocker, 2001). In addition, E. Stanley O'Neal, formerly CFO of Merrill Lynch, 29 on the Fortune 500 list, was recently appointed to President of U.S. Private Client Group. This move has caused analysts to speculate O'Neal could be Merrill's next CEO after the current CEO retires in four years (Doby, 2000). Although some gains are being made in the top echelons of major companies, the victories are few and far between. It is important to put the above information in perspective. There are currently three African-American CEOs of Fortune 500 companies; this is less than 1 percent.

Barriers to Advancement

Researchers have examined a number of structural barriers to better understand why significant numbers of African Americans have not advanced at work. The barriers include stereotyping and bias related to gender, race and ethnicity; a hostile working environment, the inability to get a mentor, tokenism and presumed incompetence and poor career planning.

Stereotypes. One of the biggest problems facing minorities in organizations is stereotypes people hold about their groups. These stereotypes are often created and spread outside the workplace through various media forms. For example, the faces of

⁴ All Fortune 500 list information was taken from Fortune, April 17, 2000 issue.

minority criminals and not White criminals are often shown on broadcast news. The resultant perception is that only minorities commit crime. A second arena is Hollywood movies, where African Americans and Latinos are often portrayed as gang members and prostitutes, while Native Americans are often seen in their native attire. Although some might argue their native garb is a source of pride, these images construct the role these groups should play in the United States (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995).

It is important to examine the stereotypes we hold because they can impact our perceptions of one another as well as the interactions that occur between members of different groups. Ogawa (1971) studied perceptions that White Americans hold of other people including Blacks, Japanese and Chicanos. Blacks were stereotyped as being argumentative, emotional, aggressive, straightforward and critical. Rich (1972; cited in Rich, 1979) studied perceptions that Black Americans had of White, Chicano and Japanese Americans. She reported that Blacks viewed White communicators quite negatively, including stereotypes like evasive, critical, conservative, ignorant and boastful. Interestingly, both Whites and Blacks stereotype each other as critical. This stereotype may have grave implications for the successful communication between members of these groups. Rich (1979) argues that the use of stereotypes, particularly the ones that Blacks hold of Whites, coupled with selective perception, can make communication between these groups difficult if not impossible at times. If the interactants view the other party as critical, based on stereotypes, the interaction may be very hostile since each person views the other as critical.

In a more recent study using the checklist method, Leonard and Locke (1993) reported that Black and White college students view one another's communication style

very negatively. Whites labeled Blacks loud, ostentatious, aggressive, active, boastful and talkative, while Blacks labeled Whites demanding, manipulative, organized, rude, critical and aggressive. Philogene (1999) studied perceptions that Black and White Americans have of African Americans. She found that each group associated more positive stereotypes with Black Americans when they were labeled as African Americans instead of Blacks or Black Americans.

Many of the barriers discussed below, including mentoring, organizational savvy, performance appraisals, tokenism and presumed incompetence have a common theme of communication. The mentoring relationship is based on communication between the mentee and mentor. When African Americans are presumed to be unqualified tokens, it is highly likely that their managers will not listen nor try to understand any of their ideas. To successfully negotiate the work world, communication is essential. As noted by the Glass Ceiling Commission, "... differing communication styles and ideas of what is appropriate and acceptable behavior can knowingly or inadvertently create barriers to advancement and can influence the supervisor's evaluation of their performance and potential" (p. 33). Unfortunately, there is no empirical research concerning what various ethnic groups view as suitable communication style in the organization, (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). In addition, very little research exists concerning how individuals of various ethnic groups view interethnic communication (e.g., Hecht and colleagues) or how individuals or various ethnic groups communicate when seeking information (e.g., Teboul).

Racism, Prejudice and Discrimination. Racism, prejudice and discrimination have been reported as the largest barrier to the advancement of African Americans (Bell

& Nkomo, 1994; Morrison, 1992; Baskerville & Tucker, 1991; Irons & Moore, 1985, cited in Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Greene, 1993). Evans and Herr (1991) report that a large percentage of African-American college students aspire to careers that provide services primarily to the Black community in areas like education, law, science and medicine. Yet in law, medicine, and engineering, Black women report more racial and gender discrimination than their White counterparts (Burlaw & Johnson, 1992). Organizational efforts to combat racism include mission statements, diversity training seminars and network groups (Friedman & Carter, 1993). However, the true impact of these efforts is not widely published and probably rarely empirically evaluated. Anecdotal evidence seems to indicate that these implementations have a positive effect on organizations that utilize them.

Racism and discrimination are also manifested in other ways. Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990) reported differences between Black and White workers with regard to access to training and development activities, performance evaluations, and career support from supervisors, and social relations. In a study of African American managers and the critical experiences they had that lead to success Davidson found that Blacks were not getting the same assignments and opportunities as White managers (Clarke, 2000).

In addition, some research has indicated that performance evaluations of Black managers are biased. The bias takes two different forms: first, the performance level of minority group members is evaluated more negatively than their actual performance dictates; second, the bias is due to differential attributions of the performance (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1993). These biases are often due to discrimination based

on global stereotypes (Bell & Nkomo, 1994). Support for differential performance attributions of African Americans has been found in the literature. Beatty (1973) found that the employer's perception of a Black supervisor's social behavior was the most important influence in evaluating employees. Cox and Nkomo (1986) also found that social factors in rating overall job performance were more important for Blacks than for Whites, while the objective task dimension was important only for Whites. The results of the Cox and Nkomo (1986) study indicate that different performance criteria are used when rating Blacks and Whites. Results of another study showed that the job performance of Black managers was less likely to be attributed to ability than was the performance of White managers (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1993). The authors reported that supervisors attribute the effective performance of Black men to good fortune and ease of the job rather than ability. These results are in line with the meta-analysis of Kraiger and Ford (1985) that showed race effects on performance ratings.

Furthermore, raters of a same race employee tend to give them higher ratings than employees of a different race. More specifically, White raters rate Whites higher than Blacks, and the same is true for Black raters (Kraiger & Ford, 1985). To the extent that bias does exist, Black managers may suffer more than White managers because there are fewer African Americans in managerial positions. However, more recent research challenges these findings. Sackett and DuBois (1991) found that White ratees received almost identically high ratings from both Black and White raters. Black ratees received lower ratings than the White ratees overall. However, Black raters rated Blacks higher than did the White raters. Sackett, DuBois and Noe (1991) argue that unlike gender, the proportion of Blacks in the group does not predict performance

ratings. When the number of women in the group was small, women received lower ratings than men even after controlling for cognitive ability, psychomotor ability, education and experience. This trend did not hold true for Blacks. The authors argue that this change may flow from actual performance differences rather than bias in ratings. To the extent that actual performance differences exist, the differences may be because Whites have experienced various developmental opportunities that many African Americans have not because of a lack of supportive relationships within the organization (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990) and exposure (Clarke, 2000).

Hostile Working Environment. Racism is sometimes accompanied by another barrier: a hostile working environment (Morrison, 1992). When top management does not support minority development and advancement, racism can flourish (DiTomaso, Thompson & Blake, 1988). Black women in fields of law, medicine and engineering perceive that their colleagues have more skepticism about their abilities, and they believe they receive less peer support than their White counterparts (Burlew & Johnson, 1992). This lack of support can gravely impact the career success of African Americans. As Ilgen and Youtz (1986) argue, a lack of supportive relationships in the organization yields fewer opportunities to enhance work-related skills. Not having a mentor may cause lack of exposure not only to challenging tasks or projects, which are important to success (DiTomaso, Thompson & Blake, 1988), but to routine tasks as well (Morrison, 1992).

Mentoring. A fourth barrier is that many minorities cannot find a mentor (Morrison, 1992; Anderson & Harris, 1990; DiTomaso, Thompson, & Blake, 1988).

Mentoring is important to the career development of employees (Davies, 1991; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1983), as mentors can help their mentees overcome various organizational obstacles. In studying Blacks in White organizations, Thomas (1990) reported that White mentees rarely formed cross-race developmental relationships while Black mentees often formed cross-race relationships. Thomas (1990) argues that cross-race relationships often do not provide the same amount of psychosocial support as same-race relations. Moreover, many blacks report that their White mentors are often passive in promoting their interests (Anderson & Harris, 1990). Yet, contrary to the anecdotal evidence that African Americans do not find mentors, Thomas (1990) found that the majority of his sample did report having mentoring relationships. In another study, Dreher and Cox (1996) reported that African-American MBAs were less likely than their White counterparts to establish mentoring relationships with White men. Those who had established mentoring relationships with White men had an additional average annual compensation of \$16, 840 over those who either did not have mentoring relationships or who had mentoring relationships with women or minority men. An analysis of the levels of the mentors revealed that the majority of mentors were 2.2 levels above their mentees. This lends credence to the perceived informal power of White men in organizations, including receiving better benefits, in this case, exhibited in the form of compensation. A study by Friedman and Carter (1993; in Bell & Nkomo, 1994) reported that 53 percent of the National Black MBA members surveyed felt they did not have the support of a mentor. The inability to find a mentor or have a mentor willing to promote the interests of their mentees can impact the development of Blacks

because there are not a large number of Blacks in higher level positions or Whites who wish to mentor Blacks.

Tokenism and Presumed Incompetence. A fifth barrier to advancement is tokenism and presumed incompetence (Bell & Nkomo, 1994). Presumed incompetence is a stereotype, but is highlighted here as a response that occurs when an African American is perceived as a token or affirmative action hire. Bell and Nkomo argue that this barrier is important because quite often it begins from the moment a Black manager enters a predominantly White organization, before competency can be established. An example of presumed incompetence is the argument that minorities do not have enough education. White, executive managers have argued that there are not enough qualified minority candidates, particularly in the field of engineering and science. Thus, Blacks are often hired into staff positions (Ravid, 1988), which are considered less powerful because they include the supervision of fewer people and fewer resources (DiTomaso, Thompson and Blake, 1988). The managers argue that minorities are in human resources because the jobs are more appropriate for their educational background and not because they have been “pigeonholed” (DiTomaso, Thompson & Blake, 1988).

Contrary to those beliefs, in a study involving 12 corporations, on average, Black managers had more education than their White counterparts (Fernandez, 1975). For Blacks to advance to similar job levels as Whites, they usually need higher levels of education (Anderson & Harris, 1990). Of course, African-American men and women with college degrees are more likely to be in executive, managerial and administrative positions than those without college degrees, as should be expected (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). However, a nearly equal proportion of White women, with only

high school education, are in the same top positions as Black men and women with college degrees. In the private sector, White men are overrepresented in top positions regardless of education level, while Black and White women continue to be underrepresented in these positions despite their college degrees. In 1990-91, 83% of the bachelor's degrees granted in business and management were conferred to Whites, while 7% were conferred to African Americans (Digest of Education Statistics, 1993). In that same year, 78% of the Master's degrees in business and management were conferred to Whites, while 4.5% were conferred to African Americans. The Ph.D. picture is even more bleak for African Americans, with 66% of the degrees being granted to Whites, while just 2% were granted to African Americans (Digest of Education Statistics, 1993). The majority of the remaining degrees were conferred to non-resident aliens. Although the statistics for Black Americans are quite low in comparison to White Americans, they indicate that there are African Americans receiving degrees in business and management and that qualified, Black recruits exist.

Poor career planning. Being in a staff position (DiTomaso, Thompson, & Blake, 1988), a fifth barrier, which may result from racism and presumed incompetence, is part of a sixth barrier: poor career planning (Morrison, 1992). As Friedman and Carter (1993) argue, "Many of the systems of normal career development -- especially informal ones -- are not readily available to Black employees"(p.5). Some of these include the inability to get a mentor (Morrison, 1992; Irons & Moore, 1985, cited in Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; DiTomaso & Thompson, 1988), which has been discussed above, limited access or complete exclusion from informal networks (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; DiTomaso, Thompson, &

Blake, 1988; Jones, 1988; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986; Jones, 1986) and lack of organizational savvy (Morrison, 1992; Thomas, 1990; Irons & Moore, 1985, cited in Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990).

Networks are important because they can provide individuals with the inside track to opportunities, resources necessary to complete the job and both formal and informal support and encouragement when promotion decisions are being made. Often members of minority groups do not have adequate opportunities to be socialized properly during the career entry and advancement stages because they are subtly blocked by Whites from participating completely in informal groups (Bell & Nkomo, 1994). If no one is available (i.e. a mentor) to identify the key players for the newcomers, as well as to guide them in terms of accepting job assignments or even training opportunities, then these individuals may suffer from lack of exposure and contact with those in the power structure.

Summary

African Americans face many barriers to advancement within organizations. These include stereotypes; racism, prejudice and discrimination; a hostile working environment; mentoring; tokenism and presumed incompetence; holding a staff position; poor career planning and being excluded from informal networks. Often these barriers are interrelated.

Chapter 4

Organizational Socialization

Organizational socialization occurs when newcomers enter the organization, learn about the culture and learn how to do their jobs, while simultaneously becoming adjusted and accepted into the organization. Socialization has been defined as the “process of learning the ropes” (Schein, 1968), and the “process by which employees are transformed from organization outsiders to participating and effective members” (Feldman, 1976). The process is complex, with many individual variations, like an individual’s style of seeking information or background experiences. To explain this complicated process, I will first describe several stage models of socialization. Then I will explore how newcomers attempt to reduce uncertainty by seeking information and learning during organizational socialization.

Stage Models

Feldman (1976), Buchanan (1974), Porter-Lawler-Hackman (1975) and Schein (1978) developed four popular stage models of the organizational socialization process during the 1970s. For a detailed description of the models in this section, refer to Wanous (1992). Each model consists of three stages. However, the various stages of the models start and end at different places. I will provide a brief contrast of the various models; for an examination of the models and how the stages overlap, see Appendix A.

Both the Feldman (1976) model and the Porter-Lawler-Hackman (1975) model have a pre-entry stage called anticipatory socialization and pre-arrival, respectively. During this stage, the expectations and values of the newcomer are matched to the expectations and values of the organization. The better these two sets of values match,

the easier the socialization process progresses (Wanous, 1992). The initial stage of the Buchanan (1974) and Schein (1978) models focuses on the first year and entry, respectively. During this stage, newcomers try to clarify their role in the organization and develop cohesion with their peers, while searching for accurate information about the organization (Wanous, 1992). Stage 3 of the Feldman and Porter-Lawler-Hackman models emphasizes the adjustment of newcomers to the competing demands of personal life and the organization, while forming new relationships within the organization. The focus of Schein's stage 3 is on mutual acceptance by both the organization and the newcomer, the time in which the newcomer becomes an insider. Buchanan's final stage is quite broad, focusing on the fifth year and beyond as a member of the organization. There are no typical experiences for the members during this stage.

In an attempt to integrate these various models into a comprehensive model of the socialization process, Wanous (1992) developed a four-stage socialization model (see Appendix A). The emphasis of the first three stages of the model is on the actual socialization process, while the fourth stage deals with the transition from newcomer to insider (Wanous, 1992). The first stage of Wanous' (1980) model is confronting and accepting organizational reality. During this stage, newcomers confirm and disconfirm their expectations about the organization. When newcomers interview for a job, often called anticipatory socialization, the organization learns about the newcomer, and the newcomer learns about the organization. As a result of this process, newcomers often will have inflated expectations of what their job and the organization will be like (Wanous, 1977, 1980 as cited in Jablin, 1987). At this stage, newcomers also recognize any conflicts between their personal values and the organizational culture.

During the second stage, newcomers strive to achieve role clarity as they learn about their job tasks and how to work within the structure/ambiguity of their department as well as the organization. The second stage is also a time when newcomers work on defining interpersonal relationships with their supervisors and peers. The third stage involves locating oneself in the organizational context. This stage is very complex and includes learning which behaviors are congruent with the organization's needs and resolving role conflict between personal activities and interests and concerns at work. Newcomers also develop both work and organizational commitment, as they meet the challenges of their first year on the job. The fourth stage focuses on successful socialization. Here the newcomer experiences high, general satisfaction, job involvement and increasing organizational commitment; both the organization and the newcomer experience feelings of mutual acceptance.

Although the stage models are very popular and useful in their descriptive nature, the stage theorists have neglected the context in which socialization occurs and the individual needs associated with the process (Chao, Kozlowski, Major & Gardner, 1994). For example, the socialization process is very different at a major Fortune 500 company versus any of the military branches (Wanous, 1992). Many organizations do not have a formal socialization program but offer an orientation program, which lasts between one half day to a week, that provides an overview of the organization and helps the newcomer reduce stress (Wanous, 1992). These organizations view on-the-job challenge as learning during the first year as the socialization process. Wanous (1992) describes socialization into the army as a difficult transition for newcomers, particularly when they realize that they are members of the organization 24 hours a day! Wanous

calls stage one environmental shock. During the first few days, various administrative tasks must be handled. Many recruits often feel overwhelmed and begin to depend on authority figures. The next stage is engagement, when the newcomer is assigned to an eight-week basic training company. This stage is what the recruits expect before enlisting: the ritual short haircut and standard issue uniforms. Although the stress level in the recruits drops at the beginning of this stage because reality matches expectations, their anger and resentment begins to build over time as they perceive little reward in return for their sacrifices. Wanous names stage three, period of attainment, during which newcomers learn how to handle weapons. For the first time, newcomers are given credit for acquiring a skill. During the last stage, period of termination, the recruits begin to express self-confidence in light of their successes during basic training.

Another shortcoming of the stage models is that they emphasize the active role of the organization in attempting to assimilate newcomers to adopt the values and culture of the organizations, while assigning a passive role to newcomers who accept and absorb the information (Schein, 1968, Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). More recent perspectives of organizational socialization recognize newcomers as proactive agents seeking information during the socialization process (e.g., Louis, 1980; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Morrison, 1993a). Research in this area has addressed such topics as information seeking (Miller & Jablin, 1991), information acquisition (Comer, 1991), feedback (Ashford & Cummings, 1985; Morrison, 1993a, 1993b) and sense-making (Louis, 1980; Settoon & Adkins, 1994). From this perspective, newcomers seek information to reduce the uncertainty that is associated with entering a new environment (Ashford & Cummings, 1983; Miller & Jablin, 1991). The supposition of

uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) is that a “surprise” or unanticipated experience will cause newcomers to try to “make sense” of their environment (Louis, 1980).

Three types of uncertainty have been identified: referent, appraisal and relational (Teboul, 1994). Referent or task uncertainty is uncertainty “about how to accomplish tasks. This uncertainty arises from a lack of functional or procedural information....a lack of understanding of organizational and work group norms, rules or meanings or even from unclear job descriptions and responsibilities...organizational change can also constitute referent uncertainty” (Teboul, 1994, pp. 202-203). Appraisal uncertainty refers to uncertainty “about being or appearing successful or competent on the job. This uncertainty may be due to a lack of feedback from role set members or derived from negative feedback from others in the organization” (Teboul, 1994, p.203). Relational uncertainty refers to uncertainty surrounding one’s personal relationships with others at work. This uncertainty “is experienced by newcomers who are unsure about how others in the organization feel about them on a personal level. Anxiety about relating to others, not knowing who to turn to for information/advice/support, and a general sense of not belonging to the social environment of the organization are also symptomatic of relational uncertainty” (Teboul, 1994, p. 203).

Teboul (1994) found that these 3 types of uncertainty occur in combinations (e.g. a newcomer reports experiencing referent and relational uncertainty in the same situation). Those in his sample, but with varying frequency, experienced each of the three uncertainty types. Newcomers were most likely to experience referent uncertainty

and least likely to experience relational uncertainty (Teboul, 1994). New hires also were more likely to experience referent and appraisal uncertainty in combination.

Seeking Information

Miller and Jablin (1991) describe seven tactics that newcomers use to seek information during the socialization process: overt questions, indirect questions, third parties, testing limits, disguising conversation, observation, and surveillance (for descriptions, see Table 1). The seven tactics have been broken into two categories: overt tactics comprised of overt questions and covert tactics comprised of the other 6 tactics (Teboul, 1997a). Overt questions consist of asking a person directly for information. The newcomer may prefer overt tactics for three reasons: they are the most efficient means to obtain specific information, they help clarify ambiguous messages and finally, they help establish a relationship with an information source that may be used in the future (Miller & Jablin, 1991).

In contrast, covert tactics are used when the newcomer is not comfortable with the source of the information. A newcomer may use indirect questions when they want to know how their supervisors rate their performance. By hinting or asking indirectly, newcomers potentially can obtain the information they need in a way that avoids embarrassment, particularly if the outcome is not favorable. When the newcomer is so uncomfortable asking indirect questions of the supervisor or the supervisor is unavailable, the new hire may opt for a third tactic: asking third parties for the information. A third party will likely be sought if the source is perceived as credible and will maintain the confidence of the interaction. Seeking a third party might also be done if the newcomer is confused by the response the supervisor provided in the above

Table 1

Communication Tactics

| Information seeking tactics | Descriptions |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Overt Questions | Used when the newcomer is comfortable with the sources. These tactics are efficient and provide clarity. |
| Indirect Questions | Used when newcomers are uncomfortable with the source of information. Most likely to be used when seeking potentially embarrassing information such as relational and appraisal information or seeking information from those of high status (e.g. (supervisors). |
| Third Parties | Used when the primary source is unavailable. Newcomers consider the credibility of the source and the potential of this source to tell the primary source about it. |
| Testing Limits | Used when the newcomer wants to gain insight into targets' attitudes toward particular behaviors or issues. Rules are deliberately broken to define relationships or priorities. |
| Disguising Conversations | Attempt to get information disguising information seeking as part of natural conversations. |
| Observing | Used when newcomers compare themselves to others. |
| Surveillance | "Just looking" to see what one observes. Stores information for later use. |

Adapted from Miller, V.D. & Jablin, F.M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. Academy of Management Review, 16(1), 92-120.

example. In this method, the newcomer must believe the source will maintain confidentiality.

Testing limits is the technique whereby employees break rules deliberately to learn their importance. For example, a newcomer may choose not to fill out a survey by the deadline to determine how important it really is. According to Miller and Jablin (1991), newcomers will use testing when the ramifications of testing are minimal. Newcomers who attempt to seek information as part of natural conversation are using a fifth tactic, disguising conversations. The new hire attempts to put the target at ease while at the same time encouraging them to talk about the topic of interest. There are many ways to do this, including joking or self-disclosure. The newcomer may want to know the unwritten rules about working overtime and weekends. So, on Monday morning, the new hire may tell Coworkers about his or her past weekend and then expect the co-worker to discuss his or her weekend in return to determine if any of it was spent in the office or working at home.

The final two tactics of observation and surveillance are similar yet distinct. Supporting empirical evidence that suggests keeping these two constructs distinct is warranted (Teboul, 1994). Observation is the newcomers' wish to compare themselves to incumbents on specific behaviors. For example, perhaps a newcomer is expected to interact with a particular client. The newcomer will observe the target interacting with the client in an effort to learn a productive manner to deal with the client. In this instance, the new hire is looking to model specific behaviors in a specific context. Surveillance is monitoring a situation to see what one observes. Analysis of the information comes later when the new hire is removed from the situation and tries to

make sense of it. Newcomers report learning information they feel is important to know but would not know how to inquire about by listening to peer conversations. For example, a newcomer may learn that although a training class is not required of employees, it is essential for advancement in the company.

Research on information-seeking strategy preferences of new hires has been equivocal. Overt information-seeking strategies are the most utilized methods (Miller 1989; Teboul, 1994; Comer, 1991). The pattern of preferences for newcomers across uncertain situations is overt questions, surveillance (monitoring), observation, indirect questions, third party, disguising and finally, testing, which is the least preferred strategy (Miller, 1989; Teboul, 1994). These findings are in conflict with Morrison's (1993b) research, which reported that new hires preferred monitoring over overt strategies. Other research has indicated that newcomers rely mostly upon observation for gaining information, followed by seeking interpersonal sources for information and finally, a small amount on experimentation or testing (Louis et al., 1983; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). In addition, some research indicates that newcomers use different information-seeking strategies depending on the type of information they are seeking.

Information Type. Before addressing the type of information that newcomers seek, a discussion of the incongruence between uncertainty reduction literature and information-seeking literature in organizational socialization is warranted. As discussed above, three common types of uncertainty reduction experienced by newcomers exist: referent, appraisal and relational uncertainty (Teboul, 1994).

Information-seeking literature has developed from a variety of sources (e.g., Miller & Jablin, 1991; Morrison, 1993a, 1993b). In recognition of the diverse origins,

Morrison (1995) attempted to develop an information-seeking typology. The typology consists of 7 types of information: technical (how to perform required tasks); referent (information pertaining to the relative job role); social (information concerning one's relationships with other people); appraisal (evaluating one's own performance); normative (information pertaining to the organizational culture); organizational (information about the company's "structure, procedures, products/services, and performance", p. 134); political (information is the internal power structure).

Intuitively, it seems that a fairly simple relationship would exist between the type of uncertainty and information-seeking behavior. For example, the operationalizations of technical and referent information seeking correspond nicely with Teboul's (1994) reducing referent uncertainty. In the only empirical study to date to test the relationship between uncertainty reduction and information-seeking behavior, no relationship was found between information types and uncertainty reduction (Teboul, 1994). The author suggests that different types of uncertainty may not be related to information types and information-seeking. Until more research is conducted in this area, the question will remain unanswered.

Differences for interpersonal sources are reported when newcomers want specific types of information. Research indicates that new hires will seek information differentially because newcomers consider appraisal, referent and technical information more important than social, normative and organizational information (Morrison, 1995). Thus, they will seek those types of information that they consider more important. When newcomers want referent information they rely on supervisors (Bruce, 1986; Comer, 1991; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Morrison, 1993b, 1995); when they want

technical information, they rely on experimentation (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). New hires report relying on observation or monitoring when they are seeking organizational information (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Morrison, 1993a), while Bruce (1986) reports that supervisors provided information about the organization to new hires.

In an effort to understand potential differences in seeking information about the organization, Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) examined the role that mentors play in the learning process during socialization. The main difference between those who had mentors and those who did not centered on the information mentors provided about the organizational domain. Thus, newcomers with mentors had more knowledge of the politics, culture and history of the organization, while newcomers without mentors spent their time learning about the contextual factors of their job and group. Interestingly, the authors also reported that supervisors appeared unhelpful when seeking this type of information (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993).

Source. Settoon and Adkins (1994) studied how newcomers made sense of the organization when they first entered it. Overall, newcomers depended more on intraorganizational sources, like supervisors and coworkers, and less on extraorganizational sources, like friends and family, who did not work in the organization. Teboul (1994) reported that new hires seek Coworkers most frequently, followed by their supervisor, friend, romantic partner, family, and finally, an internal subordinate.

When newcomers first entered the organization, using extraorganizational sources was positively related to role ambiguity and intent to leave the organization (Settoon & Adkins, 1994). Six months later, however, newcomers reported increasing

reliance on intraorganizational sources, whose use was negatively related to role conflict and intention to leave and positively related to performance (Settoon & Adkins, 1994). Thus, those who rely on intraorganizational sources are probably receiving more accurate information and are becoming better adjusted to the organization. In contrast, those who rely on extraorganizational sources are more apt to receive inaccurate or conflicting information and are more confused about their role and even the self-evaluation of their performance.

A problem associated with seeking information from intraorganizational sources is the social costs an individual perceives (Settoon & Adkins, 1995; Teboul, 1995; Miller & Jablin, 1991). Social costs have been defined as the opposite or the absence of social rewards, like acceptance. Miller and Jablin (1991) reported newcomer hesitation to ask Coworkers questions because they did not want to be excluded from future interactions, nor did they wish to appear bothersome. Similarly, others did not seek help from supervisors because they did not want to ask questions they thought they should know. The individual nature of perceived rewards and costs will cause people to respond differently in similar situations (Miller & Jablin, 1991).

When newcomers perceive the social cost of gathering information as low, they are more likely to use overt information-seeking strategies and less likely to use covert information-seeking strategies. However, if newcomers perceive the social costs as high, they will still seek information overtly, but from extraorganizational sources like romantic partners and friends (Teboul, 1995). More specifically, Teboul (1994) reported that newcomers are more likely to seek information from a friend when faced with appraisal and relational uncertainty, than when faced with referent-appraisal

uncertainty. In addition, the more often newcomers reported social support in the workplace, the less they perceived social costs in seeking information (Teboul, 1995).

While understanding how newcomers seek information is important, it is not the only concern during the socialization process. Research must also explore whether individuals learn the information they seek.

Learning

Although newcomers actively seek information as part of the socialization process, they may not actually learn anything (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Teboul (1997b) reported that the majority of his sample learned something during the organizational socialization period. The content of the learning was fairly diverse. Some reported learning things associated with referent uncertainty, such as how to accomplish a task. Others learned things associated with appraisal uncertainty, like that it was “acceptable for new hires to experience uncertainty, make mistakes or face problems at work” and that it was “acceptable for new hires to ask questions to seek help” (p.39). Still, others reported learning things associated with relational uncertainty, like “learning the organization-specific rules and standards, to whom they could go for support within the organization and to whom they could not count on for assistance or help and about their relationships at work” (p.39). There were no significant differences reported between the learning types.

Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism and the Corporate Context

Ethnic Groups

Currently, very little is known about the impact of various individual and organizational-level variables on newcomers during the socialization process. As a

whole, organizational socialization researchers have neglected to study members of different ethnic groups in the socialization process. In addition, Teboul (1997b) argues, “there is no evidence that various ethnic groups systematically learn similar things in organizations. Differences in learning opportunities might reveal inequities in the information made available to different groups, and consequently subtle forms of discrimination in organizations” (p. 41).

I could only find one study regarding ethnic differences during organizational socialization process (Teboul, 1997a). Unfortunately, the study only examined ethnic group differences based on ascribed group membership rather than racial/ethnic group identity. According to Teboul (1997a), there is little reason to anticipate differences between majority and minority groups concerning referent uncertainty. All newcomers will experience minimal uncertainty in comprehending task and procedural information (Teboul, 1998). However, appraisal and relational uncertainty are dependent on the relationships that new hires have with insiders. We know from literature discussed above that minorities have trouble finding mentors (Thomas, 1990) and becoming involved in informal networks (Ibarra, 1993, 1995). They also face a hostile work environment (Bell & Nkomo, 1994). Given this information, these two types of uncertainty may be different for minority new hires in comparison to majority new hires.

Indeed, Teboul (1997a) did find some differences among ethnic minorities. The Blacks in his sample were more likely to report experiencing relational uncertainty, over those relationships at work, than White newcomers were. In terms of referent and appraisal uncertainty, Black new hires were similar to Hispanic and White new hires.

In addition, Blacks used an overt information strategy with the same frequency, as did European Americans. (Teboul, 1998). African Americans also reported using an overt strategy with extraorganizational sources. Although they used it less than Asian Americans, they looked outside the organization more than White Americans. It was also reported that African Americans were more likely to deploy the testing strategy than Whites (Teboul, 1998). Majority and minority hires reported no difference regarding the amount of information learned (Teboul, 1998).

Biculturalism

Biculturalism has been defined as socialization and participation within two cultural contexts (Valentine, 1971 in Bell, 1990). W.E.B. DuBois wrote about African American biculturalism in the early twentieth century:

...the Negro is sort of a seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world, - a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. In this peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, - an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder (p. 9; 1903, 1993).

Although this passage was written almost 100 years ago, it still holds meaning for African Americans today, particularly in the context of corporate America.

The issue of bicultural identity in corporate America revolves around fitting into the dominant culture (Bell & Nkomo, 1994). According to Bell and Nkomo (1994), the root of the problem often is that Blacks' work lives are submerged in White, male-dominated organizations where the norms, values and culture are based on the Protestant work ethic. At the same time, other dimensions of their lives, such as

personal relationships, leisure activities and spiritual life, are rooted in African-American communities. Two examples of this have been given in the qualitative literature:

Some black managers and executives claim that they naturally fit the mold of their company and don't feel compromised. 'When I began my career in the corporation, I probably did act one way at work and another off the job,' says one black male manager for a large automobile manufacturer in Detroit. 'Now I'm more the way I am at work all the time. It's a maturation process,' he says. Others take a more pragmatic approach. One 40-year-old female executive says forthrightly, 'The choice to enter the corporation is a choice to conform. I've given up some self-expression. But, the trade-off for my \$60,000 plus salary is to play by the rules'. (p. 114, Campbell, 1990).

Bell (1990) has applied the bicultural model to professional Black women. She notes that these women may feel pressure to suppress their racial or ethnic identity. Further, she asserts that a "bicultural life structure...permits her to hold on to her Afro-American rootedness without being totally assimilated into the dominant white culture, and it permits her to enter the predominantly white world. A bicultural life transition occurs when a woman moves from one cultural context to another, requiring her to accept different cultural patterns and enact alternative roles" (p. 463). Bell found that having to deny one's racial identity was a stressor that was related to the bicultural experience. The woman quoted above has determined that her salary is worth the costs she must endure to work in this job. However, many others suffer from bicultural stress defined as a "psychological barrier for African American managers which manifests when they feel compelled to suppress and diminish one part of their identity (personal values, political ideology, interpersonal style, self-presentation) in order to exist or advance in one or both of the cultural contexts in which they work and live (Bell & Nkomo, 1994, p.32).

Another researcher discusses the balancing act that African American managers face at work:

Conformity is an unwritten rule. If you don't conform you can't be trusted - especially for higher positions. Black managers try to conform to the corporate values regarding race...If race is 'not an issue,' acceptance means you are expected to pretend race is not an issue" (p. 90, Jones, 1986).

He further asserts:

[M]ost black managers feel that to satisfy the values and expectations of the white corporate hierarchy they must run a gauntlet of contradictory pressures. Running the gauntlet means smarting from the pain of prejudice even as white colleagues deny that your reality of race has any impact. It means maintaining excellent performance even when recognition is withheld. ...Being strong but not too strong. Being confident but not egotistical to the point of alienation. ...It means seeking the trust and respect of fellow blacks and acceptance by whites. ...It means being a person who is black but not losing one's individuality by submersion into a class of "all blacks," as perceived by whites. Defining one's self while not contradicting the myriad definitions imposed by white colleagues (Jones, 1986, p.91-92).

Thus, negotiating a bicultural lifestyle can be a very stressful experience. It requires learning how to adapt effectively in two cultures in order to be accepted in both cultures. There is a common perception, that Blacks to share a common language, similar behavior patterns and a set of core values with the majority culture, yet acculturation has not occurred to the same degree for all Blacks and for most it has come with some level of stress (Anderson, 1991). Other research indicates that those who are effectively bicultural experience less anxiety and stress when fluidly alternating their behavior according to the context than those who are working towards acculturation (LaFromboise et al., 1994). Biculturalism has consistently been presented as a problem. Yet it seems that biculturalism could serve as a strategy individuals adopt

when they work to succeed in the workplace. This strategy can begin as early as the organizational socialization period.

Summary

When newcomers enter an organization they must be socialized to become effective and productive. Newcomers seek to reduce different types of uncertainty, usually favoring referent or task uncertainty. Newcomers tend to seek intraorganizational sources for information during the socialization process. Coworkers are the most sought information source for new hires followed by supervisors, friends, romantic partners, family and direct reports (Teboul, 1994).

When newcomers first enter an organization, they report seeking extraorganizational sources (Settoon & Adkins, 1994); however, those seeking extraorganizational sources are not as well socialized as those who seek intraorganizational sources and report more intentions to leave the organization. It is the perceived social costs associated with seeking information that play a part in the new hire seeking internal or external sources. The higher the perceived social costs, the more likely the new hire will seek information outside the organization.

Ethnic variation during the socialization process was reported by Teboul (1997a). African Americans experience more relational uncertainty than White new hires but similar levels of appraisal and referent uncertainty. African Americans also report using the testing strategy more often than their White American peers do. In addition, African Americans use overt strategies when dealing with their extraorganizational sources more than European American newcomers, but less than their Asian American new hires. Finally, a new approach to conceptualizing

biculturalism as a strategy people adopt to achieve organizational success was briefly presented.

Chapter 5

The Present Study

The present study was designed to address the impact that ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism have on the efforts of African-Americans to reduce uncertainty and seek information during the organizational socialization process. Restating the previous discussion, some African Americans are advancing into the top levels in organizations, while many others are not, particularly in the private sector (Bell & Nkomo, 1994). Many barriers have been identified in an attempt to understand why more African Americans do not advance as fast or as far. Some of these barriers are stereotyping and bias related to gender, race and ethnicity; a hostile working environment, the inability to get a mentor, tokenism and presumed incompetence and poor career planning.

These barriers have not been studied in the context of the organizational socialization process. Organizational obstacles that prevent the newcomer from becoming successfully socialized might lead to turnover that occurs during the early stages of socialization (Teboul, 1998). The socialization process involves seeking information to reduce referent, appraisal, and relational uncertainty.

As discussed above, a problem with many of the socialization studies is that they are unidirectional, emphasizing the impact that the organization has on the newcomer while ignoring what the newcomer brings to environment and how this contribution influences newcomers' adjustment. Jones (1983) writes, "Past experience moderates the newcomer's definition of events because, possessing these maps, newcomers are primarily deductive in the way they make sense of a new situation"

(p.314). Examples of the individual difference characteristics that newcomers bring with them to the organization include different values, preconceptions about the organization, different backgrounds, (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and past experiences (Jones, 1983). These beliefs, experiences and behaviors will not be left at the front door when an individual enters an organization, but will impact the interactions they have with insiders (Chao, Kozlowski, Major & Gardner, 1994).

One of the differences African Americans bring to the organization is their racial/ethnic identity, acculturation or biculturalism. Ethnic identity is how people feel about belonging to their ethnic group. Some people identify strongly with their group while others have a weak identification. Acculturated individuals adopt the values and norms of the majority culture, while simultaneously stripping themselves of the values and norms associated with their ethnic culture. Biculturalism is a strategy that individuals utilize in an effort to function effectively in two cultures, adopting the values and norms of the respective culture one is in. This strategy allows them to move between cultural contexts, establishing alternative roles as necessary.

The extent to which individuals are fluid and effective in expressing their biculturality through establishing alternative roles should influence the amount, type and accuracy of the information obtained by newcomers. An individuals' ability to effectively seek information and build relationships early in one's organizational career may affect the presence or absence of some of the above barriers. For example, the ability to assess one's relationships early in the socialization process and determine whom one can trust within the organization may help the newcomer identify and build a

relationship with a mentor that might help circumvent organizational obstacles at various points in the career path.

In addition, we know that newcomers prefer to seek intraorganizational sources for information; however, when they first enter an organization newcomers report seeking extraorganizational sources as well (Settoon & Adkins, 1994). When people first enter an organization, it may be hard to tell whom the newcomer can trust and who should be avoided. The higher the perceived social costs associated with seeking information internally, the more likely the new hire will seek information outside the organization. It is important that over time, the use of intraorganizational sources increases (Settoon & Adkins, 1994) because extraorganizational sources may provide the newcomer with inaccurate information that leads to a poor socialization outcome.

Teboul (1997a) has made an excellent initial step in his study of the socialization process and ethnic groups. He found demographic differences in the information seeking strategies used during the uncertainty reduction process. African Americans report experiencing more relational uncertainty than White new hires but similar levels of appraisal and referent uncertainty. This is in line with what we know about the barriers discussed above. It is difficult for African Americans to break into the informal networks in organizations (Ibarra, 1993; Nixon, 1984), it is also difficult for them to get mentors (Thomas, 1990). Because African Americans have difficulty forming relationships in organizations, they will have trouble knowing the status of their interpersonal social relationships within the organization. However, dividing ethnic groups on the basis of their ascribed group membership rather than their subjective identification limits the utility of this information.

Hypotheses

Now I will examine how ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism impact African Americans in the work context of organizational socialization. In an examination of the literature of the three above-mentioned areas, biculturalism seems to be the most clearly related to reducing uncertainty during the organizational socialization process. Thus, each hypothesis is framed around the construct of biculturalism. Each of the predicted relationships will also be tested using ethnic identity and acculturation. Based on the above summation of the literature, the following hypotheses will be explored⁵.

Uncertainty Reduction

Hypothesis 1: Those high in biculturalism will report experiencing more relational uncertainty than referent and appraisal uncertainty.

One's level of biculturalism will predict uncertainty reduction processes. More specifically, those who are low in biculturalism will report experiencing similar amounts of referent and appraisal uncertainty. Those low in biculturalism are more similar to those who are acculturated and have accepted the attitudes, values and behaviors of the mainstream as their own. Dana (1993) argues that those who are acculturated will behave similarly to Whites (Landrine & Klonoff, 1995). Those who

⁵ The present study is designed to examine African Americans. I am choosing only to include African Americans in the sample and not have a control group of White Americans. The rationale is threefold. First, by using a control group of White Americans, it implicitly makes White Americans the baseline from which all behavior should be measured. Secondly, many White Americans do not report their ethnic identity or consider it important (Phinney, 1992). Finally, the organizational socialization literature has been based on White Americans, so much of what we know, with the exception of the Teboul (1997a) study, has focused on White Americans.

are high in biculturalism can adopt the values of the culture they are in but recognize that they are not a true part of the mainstream. Teboul (1997a) reported that African Americans, as a monolithic, demographic group, reported experiencing more relational uncertainty than White Americans. Those who are high in biculturalism can adopt the values of the culture they are in but recognize that they are not a true part of the mainstream. Teboul (1997a) reported that African Americans, as a monolithic, demographic group, reported experiencing more relational uncertainty than White Americans.

Information-seeking strategies

Hypothesis 2: Those high in biculturalism are more likely to report using the covert information-seeking strategies, in particular, testing.

Biculturalism level will predict the type of information-seeking strategy used. Those who are high in biculturalism have a “double consciousness” and a “two-ness” of their being both an American and a member of the African-American group (DuBois, 1903). African Americans who live bicultural lives know that they must adapt to the dominant culture in order to be successful (Bell & Nkomo, 1994), particularly when they first enter an organization (Campbell, 1990). Yet adapting to the dominant culture at work does not necessarily mean that individuals will give up their ethnic identity completely. Rather, those who lead bicultural lives often recognize that they behave a certain way at work in a White, male-dominated environment and another way in their leisure time, which is often spent with members of the African-American community.

In addition, those who are bicultural will recognize that they are outsiders, based on being new hires and African-American. It is likely that biculturals will feel

uncomfortable asking information overtly because they perceive they may not get the correct information. Similar to findings by Teboul (1998) for African Americans, high biculturals will be more likely to report using more covert strategies, particularly testing.

Sources

Hypothesis 3a: Higher biculturalism is associated with greater seeking of intraorganizational sources.

Hypothesis 3b: Higher biculturalism is associated with greater seeking of extraorganizational sources.

Hypothesis 3c: Higher biculturalism is associated with greater seeking of African-American internal and external sources.

Those who are bicultural know they are negotiating two environments. Part of being biculturally competent involves being grounded or having support networks in both cultures (LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1994). Bicultural new hires will seek internal sources for information to try to understand “what it’s really like” to be an African-American working in the organization. Biculturals will still seek European American sources when they perceive they will receive the information they are seeking.

However, biculturals will seek extraorganizational sources to help them interpret certain situations. To remain grounded and establish support networks in the African-American community, biculturals will seek African Americans externally. It seems likely that biculturals will realize when they are not being incorporated into the organizational networks and seek information elsewhere, even if it means externally.

Perceived Social Costs

Hypothesis 4a: Higher perceived social costs are associated with greater use of covert information-seeking strategies rather than overt information-seeking strategies.

The perceived social costs of seeking information will predict the type of information seeking strategy used. When perceived social costs are high, newcomers will seek information through covert strategies rather than overt strategies. Teboul (1995) has reported that when newcomers perceive high social costs in seeking information, they prefer to seek information covertly and prefer overt information seeking strategies when they perceive low social costs.

Hypothesis 4b: Higher perceived social costs are associated with greater use of extraorganizational sources than intraorganizational sources.

Teboul (1994) has found that newcomers are most likely to seek information from their Coworkers, followed by their supervisors, friends, romantic partner, family and finally an internal subordinate. New hires may perceive social costs in asking internal sources, like supervisors, for information because they feel they should already know it and do not want to appear burdensome or incompetent (Miller & Jablin, 1991).

Hypothesis 4c: High biculturalism is associated with high perceived social costs.

The above findings were reported for a predominantly White sample. Thus, it is anticipated that acculturated African Americans will perceive high social costs.

However, bicultural African Americans may perceive even higher social costs because they are new to the organization and they are aware that they are negotiating two

contexts. This awareness may force them to anticipate more perceived social costs when they evaluate various strategies and sources to seek information.

Hypothesis 5a: Perceived social costs moderate the relationship between one's level of biculturalism and the type of information-seeking strategy used.

Specifically, when perceived social costs are high, those high in biculturalism will be more likely to use covert information-seeking strategies than when the perceived social costs are low.

Hypothesis 5b: Perceived social costs moderate the relationship between one's level of biculturalism and the source sought for the information. Specifically, when perceived social costs are high, those high in biculturalism will be more likely to seek extraorganizational sources than when the perceived social costs are low.

As mentioned above, both ethnic identity and perceived social costs will predict the information-seeking strategy used and source sought for the information. Yet, perceived social costs will likely moderate the relationship between one's level of biculturalism and information seeking strategy and source.

Learning

Hypothesis 6: High biculturalism is associated with greater learning about relationships at work.

Learning refers to the knowledge acquired during uncertainty reduction (Teboul, 1997b). It is anticipated that high bicultural African Americans will experience relational uncertainty. In addition, African Americans often report exclusion from organizational networks (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995; Ibarra, 1993). Those who

are bicultural are probably more aware of their exclusion from networks and will try to understand who are their sources and non-support at work.

Chapter 6

Method

Data Collection/Procedure

To be included in the final analysis, participants had to meet three criteria: (1) identify themselves as Black or African American, (2) work in their current job for two years or less (3) not be in an administrative assistant role. The job of administrative assistant or secretary was excluded from the sample analyses because I believed that those in secretarial networks might seek information in a different way.

IRB approval was received before collecting data. Participation in this study was voluntary and confidentiality assured. Multiple vehicles were used to solicit participation. Most of the data were collected on a website via the Internet. A small number of questionnaires were collected through directed mailings and undergraduate classes.⁶

Internet. Articles about the study, including information for contacting the researcher and the website address appeared in (1) a local, suburban newspaper, (2) the National Association of Black Management Consultants Magazine, (3) Power Moves for People of Color on-line newsletter and the (4) Black Voices website.

⁶ It was necessary to determine the appropriate sample size to detect significant differences not due to chance for the interaction terms in the hierarchical regression analysis. Tables (Jaccard, Turrisi and Wan, 1990) that were examined based on power of .8, alpha = .05, an estimated squared multiple correlation of main effects model = .10 and an estimated squared multiple correlation of full model = .15 indicated that 135 subjects were needed. It would be next to impossible to find 135 participants that meet the above criteria in one organization. In addition, focusing solely on African-American professional or social organizations presupposed the potential importance that ethnic identity may play to those who belong to these organizations.

Information advertising the study was sent to the distribution lists of chapters of 100 Black Women of New York and of a black sorority, various groups of an international financial services organization and personal e-mail address lists provided to the researcher. An advertisement about the study was also posted on a bulletin board of a global human resources firm.

Two hundred and thirty-four (234) people visited the site (see Table 2 for participation rates). Of those, 17 did not answer any questions, 93 filled out three sections or less, and 124 completed and submitted the entire survey. Only those that completed all five sections of the survey were included, yielding a response rate of 53%.

Direct questionnaires. The president of a placement firm contacted some of her recent new hire placements by letter, describing the study and asking those interested to contact the researcher directly. Questionnaires were sent to those who requested them. Other questionnaires were sent to members of a church group, to a contact at an organization that develops and places minority youth in corporate internships that often lead to full-time jobs, and to a contact at a medical center. Forty-eight surveys were mailed out and 18 returned for a 38% response rate.

Data were also collected in an Introductory Psychology class at CUNY, Baruch College. In order not to single out African American students, the whole class was given an opportunity to complete the questionnaire for extra credit. Of the 128 who

Table 2**Participation Rates**

| Method of Collection | Number Distributed | Number Completed | Response Rate |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Website Collection | 234 visits to site | 124 completed surveys | 53% |
| Paper and pencil (mailed, e-mail requests, undergraduate Psychology class ⁷) | 60 | 21 | 35% |
| Total | 294 | 145 | 49% |

⁷ All students in the Psychology class were offered the opportunity to complete the survey for extra credit. Surveys were completed by 128 students, however, only 12 of those identified as African American.

completed the questionnaire, 12 self-identified as African American. Of those, 3 were usable based on the criteria of inclusion for this study as described above.

Survey packets included an introductory letter (see Appendix L), two copies of the consent form (see Appendix M) and the questionnaire, which will be discussed in detail below. Two copies of the consent form were included: one copy was for the participant's records and one to mail back to the researcher. Also included were a researcher-addressed stamped envelope, an index card to write their name and address to receive a copy of the results, and a separate envelope in which to mail the consent form and post card to ensure confidentiality.

Participants

A total of 145 individuals completed questionnaires. If any of the three previously stated criteria for inclusion in the study was not met, the participant was dropped from the sample (n=13). Two additional surveys were excluded because of excessive missing data in some sections of the survey. One hundred-thirty participants were included in the final analyses.

Table 3 contains demographic information about the sample. Females comprise 69% of the sample. Respondents range from 18 to 54 years; 70% of the participants were between 25 and 34 years old. One-third of participants had a Bachelor's degree, while 43% had an advanced degree, such as a Master's degree, Ph.D. or JD.

Through self-report, participants were asked how many employees worked in their organization and the percentage of African Americans employed by the organization. Organizations ranged from fewer than 50 employees to 100,000 employees and are represented fairly evenly, with 22% of the sample working in an

Table 3

Participants' Demographic Information

| N=130 | | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Sex | | | |
| | Male | 40 | 31.0 |
| | Female | 89 | 69.0 |
| | No response | 1 | 0.01 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Age | | | |
| | Less than 25 years old | 14 | 10.8 |
| | 25-29 years old | 65 | 50.0 |
| | 30-34 years old | 26 | 20.0 |
| | 35-39 years old | 11 | 8.5 |
| | 40-44 years old | 7 | 5.4 |
| | 45-49 years old | 3 | 2.3 |
| | 50-54 years old | 2 | 1.5 |
| | No response | 2 | 1.5 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Education | | | |
| | High School Graduate | 3 | 2.3 |
| | Some College | 11 | 8.5 |
| | Associate Degree | 3 | 2.3 |
| | Bachelor Degree | 43 | 33.1 |
| | Some Graduate Work | 14 | 10.8 |
| | Master Degree | 34 | 26.2 |
| | Ph.D. | 5 | 3.8 |
| | JD | 13 | 10.0 |
| | JD & Ph.D. | 1 | .8 |
| | Ed.D. | 1 | .8 |
| | Master & JD | 1 | .8 |
| | Medical Degree | 1 | .8 |

Table 3 (cont'd.)

Participants' Demographic Information

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| Number of Employees in Organization (self-report) | | |
| Less than 50 | 24 | 18.5 |
| 50-100 | 15 | 11.5 |
| 100-500 | 19 | 14.6 |
| 500-1000 | 15 | 11.5 |
| 1,000-10,000 | 29 | 22.3 |
| 10,000-50,000 | 15 | 11.5 |
| 60,000-100,000 | 11 | 8.5 |
| over 100,000 | 2 | 1.5 |
| Percentage of African Americans in Organizations (self-report) | | |
| Less than 10% | 39 | 30.0 |
| 10-20% | 43 | 33.0 |
| 21-30% | 9 | 7.0 |
| 31-40% | 4 | 3.1 |
| 41-50% | 3 | 2.3 |
| 51-60% | 2 | 1.5 |
| 61-70% | 3 | 2.3 |
| 71-80% | 2 | 1.5 |
| 81-90% | 5 | 3.8 |
| 91-100% | 6 | 4.6 |
| No response | 14 | 10.8 |

organization that employs 1,000-10,000 people. Sixty-three percent of respondents worked in organizations that employ 20% or fewer African Americans.

In addition, participants represented a variety of industries and professions. Examples of the industries represented include non-profit, higher education, financial services, law and healthcare. Some of the professions are human resource professionals, accountants, software engineers and lawyers.

Measures

Ethnic Identity. Ethnic identity was measured using the revised version of Phinney's (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; see Appendix D for all scale items). MEIM is a 12-item scale, with each item rated on a 4-point scale from 4 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). The last item, checking the group category to which a participant belongs, was included in the original scale and was kept in this survey as a check against the open-ended self-identifying item.

Phinney and her colleagues (Roberts et al., 1999) recently completed a factor analysis on a large sample of adolescents and argued that the measure comprises two components: exploration and affirmation/belonging (as compared to three factors in the original measure). Exploration is a developmental and cognitive component. One item in the 5-item factor is "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs." The second factor, affirmation/belonging, is an affective component. An example of an item in the 7-item subscale is "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group".

The scale was validated with data obtained from 5,496 students from middle schools in the Houston metropolitan area. Analyses were conducted for the overall

sample as well as for three specific groups: European American, African American, Mexican American. The overall reliability (Cronbach's alpha) was $r = .85$ for all groups and $.82$ for African Americans; for the Affirmation/Belonging subscale, $r = .84$ for all groups and $.83$ for African Americans; and for the Exploration subscale, $r = .70$ for all groups and $.62$ for African Americans. The total scale and two subscales will be used in this study.

Acculturation. Acculturation was measured using 29 items from the 33-item African American Acculturation Scale II (AAAS II, Landrine and Klonoff, 1995) were selected (see Appendix C, items 1-33 for scale items). The scale is comprised of 10 factors (see Table 4 for factors and item examples). One factor (Traditional Food), consisting of four items, was deleted because I believed it to be extremely stereotypical and potentially offensive to participants.⁸ The total scale score will be used to test hypotheses.

To be consistent with other measures in this study, AAAS II ratings were made on a 5-point (Likert) scale, rather than the 7-point scale used by Landrine and Klonoff. According to Landrine and Klonoff (1994), lower scores indicate an acculturated orientation, moderate scores indicate a bicultural orientation and high scores indicate a traditional orientation. Due to the construction of the scale, it will be considered a unidimensional measure of acculturation with high scores indicating less acculturation and low scores indicating more acculturation. Reported reliability for the total scale

⁸ A sample item of the Traditional Food subscale is "I know how to cook chit'lins".

Table 4

Factors of the African American Acculturation Scale

| Factor Name | Item Example |
|--|--|
| Preference for Things African American | Most of the music I listen to is by Black artists. |
| Religious Beliefs/Practices | I like gospel music. |
| Traditional Food | Sometimes I cook ham hocks. |
| Traditional Childhood | I grew up in a mostly Black neighborhood. |
| Superstitions | I avoid splitting a pole. |
| Interracial Attitudes/Cultural Mistrust | IQ tests were purposefully set up to discriminate against Black people. |
| Falling Out | I have seen people “fall out.” |
| Traditional Games | When I was a child, I used to play tonk. |
| Traditional Family Values | It’s better to try to move your whole family ahead in this world than it is to be out for only yourself. |
| Family Practices | When I was young, my parent(s) sent me to stay with a relative (aunt, uncle, grandmother) for a few days or weeks, and then I went back home again. |

score was $r = .88$ for a sample including African Americans and a small number of Whites, Latinos and Asians. The reported reliability was $r = .81$ for African Americans alone.

Biculturalism. A measure of biculturalism was created from items generated from Bell's (1990) research on African-American career-oriented women. Three researchers, in addition to the author, read the work by Bell and then discussed how to measure the construct. The author took that information and created items; the other three researchers then provided comments for both content and grammar.

Items were generated because it was unclear if the acculturation knowledge and practices assessed in the AAASII would impact a work context. The focus of the AAASII is on social aspects of life such as traditional values and food, religious beliefs/practices, traditional games and superstitions. One of the subscales, interracial attitudes/cultural mistrust, could impact work behavior, but in the very limited capacity of indicating trust of the majority culture.

In a literature search of the construct of biculturalism, few articles were found discussing the biculturalism of African Americans. Bell's research is based on life experiences of black women who had career orientations. In her sample of bicultural women, their personal lives were in the black community while their careers were in the white world. Bell examined the ways that these women managed the professional and personal aspects of their lives. For a complete list of items, see Appendix C, items 34-46. The items were included in the same scale as Landrine and Klonoff (1995), discussed above. All items are scored in the direction as written. A factor analysis of these items is presented in the Results chapter.

Uncertainty Reduction. Uncertainty reduction type was measured using narratives, following procedures developed by Teboul (1994). Participants were asked to recall an event that was uncertain to them when they entered the organization. They were asked to describe the event...What happened next?...How did it end? (For complete instructions, see Appendix E)

The narratives were subsequently content coded based on Teboul's (1994) New Hire Uncertainty Typology (for a detailed description of the categories and their development, refer to Teboul, 1994). The typology includes seven different categories and is based on three types of uncertainty reduction: (a) referent, (b) appraisal, and (c) relational. The other four categories account for these three types of uncertainty occurring in the same narrative: (d) referent and appraisal, (e) referent and relational, (f) appraisal and relational, and (g) referent, appraisal and relational. The narratives are coded into one of the above seven categories or as "other" if the narrative does not fit into one of the categories.

Information-seeking strategy and source of information. These constructs are measured using Teboul's (1994) 14-item scale (see Appendix F for scale items). Each of Miller and Jablin's (1991) seven information-seeking strategies (see Table 2) is measured using two items. For each item, participants circle as many of the three intra-organizational sources (supervisor, co-worker, subordinate) and the three extraorganizational sources (romantic partner, family, friend) they seek for information.

For each item, each source was coded as 0 (not used) or 1 (used). The extent to which each strategy was used was determined by adding the total number of sources (0-6) used for both items representing the respective strategy. Scores range from 0-12.

Using this method, scores can be calculated for reliance on a source by adding the use of the source across all items. Scores range from 0-14. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated for each information-seeking strategy by source targeted. In two separate studies, Teboul reports reliability estimates ranging from $r = .83$ to $.94$.

I added a component to the measure for this study. Next to each target were two columns, one labeled "S" and the other labeled "E.B.". After participants completed the 14 items by circling the targets they sought, they were asked to go back and check the S box if the target was the same sex as them and the E.B. box if the target was the same ethnic background as them. A similar scoring method described above was used for sex and ethnic background. For each item, the source was coded as 0 (not the same) and 1 (for the same) for both sex and ethnic background. Scores represent the number of times the participant relied on a source of the same sex or ethnic background, not how many people. The extent to which people of the same sex and ethnic background were used for each strategy ranges from 0-12. Scores for each source range from 0-14.

Perceived social costs. Perceived social costs was measured using Miller's (1989) 6 item scale, which was revised by Teboul (1995; see Appendix G items 1-5). An example item is "I was not embarrassed to seek this information." Teboul used this scale after participants described an uncertain event they experienced and before they filled out the Newcomer Uncertainty Measure. The phrase "this information" refers to the scenario they described. After deleting an unclearly worded item, the reliability for this scale in Teboul (1995) was $r = .74$.

Social Support. Both intraorganizational and extraorganizational social support were measured using two different instruments. Social support of those outside work

including friends, family and significant others was measured using a 12-item instrument developed Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, and Farley (1988). Each of the components was measured with four items on a 7-point Likert scale. An example item for the Friends subscale is “I can count on my friends when things go wrong.” Similar items are used to measure the social support of family and significant others as well (for all the items see Appendix H). The reported reliability of the scale on a college sample is .88. Subscale reliabilities are .87 for Family, .85 for Friends and .91 for Significant Other. Zimet and his colleagues (1990) reexamined the instrument on three different subject groups: pregnant women, adolescents living in Europe with their families, and pediatric residents. They found even higher reliability coefficients. The range for each of the subscales was: Friends: $r = .90-.94$; Family $r = .81-.90$; Significant Other $r = .83-.98$ and for the whole scale $r = .84-.92$.

Social support at work was measured using the Views instrument (Thompson, Morrison & Iawata, 1994). This instrument measures support, recognition, challenges, barriers and perceptions of the work environment. The support construct in this scale measures multiple types of support including sharing information, opportunities for development and work/life balance. The work/life balance items were not included in this study (see Appendix I). The questions used for this study measure support received now and the support needed by the person. Total scores were calculated for both the now and need subscales. A difference score was calculated: receive now – need now. A positive number indicates receiving more support than one needs; a negative number indicates receiving less support than one needs and zero means receiving the right amount of support needed. The reported reliability for the support now subscale is $r =$

.88 and the reported reliability for the support need subscale is $r = .90$ (the reported reliabilities include more items than were used in this study). The reported reliability for the difference score is not available.

Learning. Learning was measured using an adaptation of Teboul's (1997b) Newcomer Learning Typology (see Appendix J for a list of items included in each type of learning below). Participants check off what they learned from the situation they described in the New Hire Uncertainty Typology. Twenty-five items were generated based on nine types of learning coded by Teboul (1997b). These include: (1) how to accomplish a task, norms/standards for new hires; (2) facing uncertainty, problems, mistakes (norms 1); (3) asking questions or for assistance (norms 2); (4) idiosyncratic workplace norms; (5) self-appraisal; (6) other appraisal; (7) sources of support and satisfaction with support; (8) sources of nonsupport and dissatisfaction with support; (9) nature of relationships at work. There were three items that participants could use to write in any learning that was not indicated on the checklist. Each item that was checked was scored with a "1" and each that was blank was given a "0". The types of learning and the total amount learned were calculated by adding the items in the respective category.

Demographics. The MEIM allows participant to self-identify. There is also a forced choice category in this measure. Other demographic information included sex, age, highest level of education achieved, the industry where one worked, the type of socialization program an organization had, the size of the organization, the individuals current field and how long the individual had been in the current job (see Appendix K for all questions).

Chapter 7

Results

This chapter is divided into 3 sections. The first is scale properties and includes means, ranges and reliabilities for the scales used in this study. The analyses section includes a restatement of each hypothesis and the statistical analysis used to test the hypothesis. Finally, some additional exploratory analyses are presented.

Scale Properties

Table 5 includes the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum ranges, and alpha coefficients for key variables. Changes made to the scales as described in the previous chapter and certain scale properties will now be discussed.

Ethnic Identity and the AAAS II. The total scale of the MEIM and each subscale are presented in Table 5. The reliabilities for the MEIM and each scale are similar to Phinney's reported reliabilities. For the affirmation subscale, the mean is high, 3.72 out of 4.00, and the variance is small, .57. However, there was no rationale to transform the MEIM, thus it was used in its' current form. Four items, one factor, were removed from the AAAS II. However, the reliability of the total scale was still acceptable, $r=.72$ and above Nunally's recommended alpha level of .70.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, Range and Alpha Coefficients for Key Variables

| Scale | Mean | S.D. | Minimum | Maximum | Alpha |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Identity | 3.53 | .550 | 1 | 4 | .91 |
| Exploration | 3.26 | .618 | 1 | 4 | .73 |
| Affirmation/Belonging | 3.72 | .569 | 1 | 4 | .93 |
| AAAS II ⁹ | 94.05 | 13.17 | 57 | 120 | .72 |
| Total Bicultural | 19.44 | 5.77 | 7 | 31 | .75 |
| Bounded Bicultural | 12.97 | 3.98 | 4 | 20 | .72 |
| Conflicted Bicultural | 6.55 | 2.76 | 3 | 15 | .61 |
| Perceived social costs | 2.19 | .92 | 1 | 4.6 | .75 |
| Social Support (Personal) | 5.89 | .935 | 2 | 7 | .86 |
| Family Social Support | 5.71 | 1.36 | 1 | 7 | .91 |
| Friends Social Support | 6.03 | 1.08 | 2.25 | 7 | .90 |
| Other Social Support | 5.90 | 1.43 | 1 | 7 | .90 |
| Views Support (Work) | | | | | |
| Now-Need | | | -20 | 19 | .80 |
| Now | | | 8 | 40 | .84 |
| Need | | | 9 | 40 | .84 |

⁹ The bicultural scale is used as an additive scale based on the Landrine & Klonoff (1995) use of the AAAS II. The bicultural items were included in the measure.

Biculturalism. A principal components factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation was conducted on 11 items. One item was not included because it did not correlate with the other items¹⁰. In the first solution, three components were extracted. One item was deleted because it loaded on two components. The items were rerun three times and various items deleted because of poor fit. The final solution is presented in Table 6. Two factors account for 56.79% of the variance: factor 1 accounts for 40.77% and factor 2 accounts for 16.02% of the variance.

Two unidimensional scales emerged in the factor analysis. The first factor is named compartmentalized or bounded bicultural. The factor focuses on being conscious of one's behavior around white people, code switching or behaving differently around black people when white people are present, and leading completely different personal and professional lives.

The second factor is labeled conflicted bicultural. This factor deals with feeling pulled between work and one's social community. These individuals struggle to challenge stereotypes of African Americans at work while trying to retain their roots and remain grounded in the black community.

The correlation between these two factors is $r = .45$ ($p < .01$). The correlation is moderate, suggesting that the two factors are probably measuring different aspects

¹⁰ To avoid capitalizing on chance in interpreting the standard error of the factor loadings, Stevens (1996) argues that researchers should use a more stringent criterion than $/.30/$ when determining acceptable factor loadings. Sample size should be taken into account in setting the significance value and doubling the critical values (cv) for $p < .01$. In this case, for $n = 130$, $cv = .237(2) = .474$. Only items with factor loadings over $.47$ are included in the scale.

Table 6

Component Loadings for Bicultural Scale

| | Components | |
|--|------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 |
| While at work, I behave differently around black people when white people are also present. | .730 | .108 |
| I feel pulled between my achievements at work and my roots. | .246 | .771 |
| I am very conscious of my behavior around white people at work. | .847 | .003 |
| I lead two completely different lives; one professional, one personal. | .602 | .396 |
| I spend a great deal of my time at work challenging stereotypical images of African Americans. | .281 | .616 |
| I constantly struggle to remain black in a white world. | -.002 | .773 |
| I have to stay one step ahead to prove I am qualified. | .650 | .247 |

of biculturalism. However, for analysis, a total bicultural score was calculated by adding the items of both factors. Results will be reported first for the combined measure and then for the 2 subscales.

The only alpha coefficient that falls below Nunally's recommended alpha level is the conflicted bicultural scale. The conflicted bicultural (alpha = .61) and bounded bicultural (alpha = .72) scales were developed for use in this study and have not been subject to multiple revisions. Even though the conflicted bicultural alpha is below the recommended level, it is still well above .50 indicating that the subscale is more reliable than chance. It is recommended that more items are developed in the future to strengthen the reliability of this scale, but it will be used in this study to further explain analyses where the total biculturalism scale is used.

Uncertainty Reduction. The open-ended responses for the Uncertainty Reduction measure were content coded based on the respective Typology developed by Teboul (1994). Three coders, including the author, were trained on the typology. Percent of agreement between raters was low, ranging from .47 - .73. Subsequently, the raters met, discussed and re-coded those scenarios for which there had been no agreement. Only four of the narratives were coded as multiple types of uncertainty occurring in the same narrative. These four were excluded from the analyses.

Learning. There were 21 write-in comments. Nineteen were coded into existing categories by the author. The other two were excluded from further analysis. Thus, it seems the items generated according to Teboul's typology are fairly representative of the learnings that occur for new hires.

Social Support. Only some items from the Views instrument support scale were used in this study. A principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was run on the items to determine if they loaded on the appropriate Now or Need scale. All of the items loaded onto the appropriate scale with the exception of one now/need item that loaded on its own factor: “My immediate supervisor encourages me to try new ways of doing things even when there are some risks involved”. It is not clear why this occurred, so the item was included in the respective now or need score.

The reliability for both the now and need subscales, $r = .84$ is less than the reported reliability coefficients of $r = .88$ and $r = .90$, respectively. However, only about half of the items from the original scale were used in this study. Reliability coefficients tend to be lower with fewer items¹¹.

Reception to the Work Environment. For this study, a measure was created to determine peer and supervisor reception of the newcomer. These are the most important internal sources of information reported in the literature (see Appendix H, items 6-9). A principal components analysis was conducted on the four items. The four variables loaded on a single factor. The reliability for these four items was low, $r = .50$.

Correlations of key variables in the study are presented in Tables 7A- 7D. All data were collected through a self-report survey. The results of the study may be

¹¹ The reliability for the difference score was calculated using the equation $D=X-Y$, where X is the score on the first measure and Y is the score on the second (see Crocker & Algina (1986) for derivation of the formula).

Table 7A

Correlation Matrix of Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism and Internal & External Source of Information-Seeking

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | Ethnic ID | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Identity Search | .907** | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Identity Affect | .943** | .716** | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Acculturation | .026 | .132 | -.058 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Total Bicultural | -.042 | .088 | -.148 | .267** | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Conflicted Bic. | -.036 | .094 | .131 | .257** | .783** | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 7 | Bounded Bic. | -.038 | .050 | -.115 | .198* | .899** | .449** | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 8 | Intraorg Sources | .076 | .091 | .075 | -.011 | -.030 | .067 | -.093 | 1.00 | | | | |
| 9 | Extraorg Sources | .037 | .121 | -.029 | .122 | -.183* | -.047 | -.186* | .305** | 1.00 | | | |
| 10 | Intraorg Sources Same EB ¹ | .122 | .123 | .104 | .044 | -.160 | -.084 | -.176 | .225* | .060 | 1.00 | | |
| 11 | Extraorg Sources Same EB | .125 | .207** | .051 | .185* | -.135 | -.025 | -.141 | .150* | .766** | .168* | 1.00 | |
| 12 | Sources of Same EB | .162* | .217** | .100 | .152 | -.196* | -.069 | -.207* | .241** | .214** | .553** | .746** | 1.00 |

Note: All correlations are one-tailed.

* p<.01

** p<.05

¹ EB stands for ethnic background.

Table 7B

Correlation Table of Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, Social Costs and Specific Sources of Information-Seeking

| | | Ethnic ID | Identity Search | Identity Affect | Acculturation | Total Bicultural | Conflicted Bicultural | Bounded Bicultural |
|----|------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 8 | Social Costs | .175* | .216** | .105 | .295** | .262** | .251** | .227** |
| 13 | Supervisor | .062 | .079 | .062 | .006 | .017 | .127 | -.060 |
| 14 | Coworker | .133 | .147* | .119 | .013 | -.002 | .036 | -.052 |
| 15 | Direct Report | -.024 | -.012 | -.014 | -.079 | -.099 | -.018 | -.111 |
| 16 | Romantic Partner | -.042 | .019 | -.086 | -.015 | -.073 | .002 | -.060 |
| 17 | Family | .172* | .205** | .120 | .134 | -.242** | -.045 | -.285** |
| 18 | Friend | -.043 | .058 | -.103 | .151 | -.102 | -.060 | -.089 |

* p<.01

** p<.05

Table 7B (cont'd.)

Correlation Table of Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, Social Costs and Specific Sources of Information-Seeking

| | | Social Costs | Supervisor | Coworker | Direct Report | Romantic Partner | Family | Friend |
|----|------------------|--------------|------------|----------|---------------|------------------|--------|--------|
| 8 | Social Costs | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 13 | Supervisor | .072 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 14 | Coworker | .064 | .617** | 1.00 | | | | |
| 15 | Direct Report | .049 | .437** | .375** | 1.00 | | | |
| 16 | Romantic Partner | .029 | .315** | .187* | .135 | 1.00 | | |
| 17 | Family | .195* | .253** | .155 | .086 | .372** | 1.00 | |
| 18 | Friend | .207* | .224* | .215* | .123 | .432** | .452** | 1.00 |

* p<.01

** p<.05

Table 7C

Correlation Table of Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, and Intraorganizational Types of Information-Seeking

| | | Ethnic ID | Identity Search | Identity Affect | Acculturation | Total Bicultural | Conflicted Bicultural | Bounded Bicultural |
|----|--|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 19 | Intraorg Overt | -.024 | -.031 | .006 | -.173* | -.105 | -.046 | -.129 |
| 20 | Intraorg Indirect | .027 | .080 | .000 | .068 | .103 | .169* | .046 |
| 21 | Intraorg Third Party | .028 | .063 | .027 | -.045 | -.167* | -.067 | -.210* |
| 22 | Intraorg Testing | .055 | .034 | .061 | .137 | -.043 | .009 | -.049 |
| 23 | Intraorg Disguising Conversations | .053 | .054 | .053 | .092 | -.070 | .028 | -.138 |
| 24 | Intraorg Observation | .070 | .080 | .065 | -.055 | .030 | .024 | .022 |
| 25 | Intraorg Surveillance | .158* | .167* | .142 | -.014 | .025 | .123 | -.048 |

* p<.01

** p<.05

Table 7C (cont'd.)

Correlation Table of Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, and Intraorganizational Types of Information-Seeking

| | | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
|----|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 19 | Intraorg Overt | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 20 | Intraorg Indirect | .339** | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 21 | Intraorg Third Party | .274** | .222** | 1.00 | | | | |
| 22 | Intraorg Testing | .467** | .554** | .134 | 1.00 | | | |
| 23 | Intraorg Disguising Conversations | .436** | .551** | .295** | .580** | 1.00 | | |
| 24 | Intraorg Observation | .414** | .455** | .232** | .318** | .433** | 1.00 | |
| 25 | Intraorg Surveillance | .580** | .505** | .192* | .385** | .439** | .634** | 1.00 |

* p<.01

** p<.05

Table 7D

Correlation Table of Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, and Extraorganizational Types of Information-Seeking

| | | Ethnic ID | Identity Search | Identity Affect | Acculturation | Total Bicultural | Conflicted Bicultural | Bounded Bicultural |
|----|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 26 | Extraorg Overt | .046 | .121 | -.016 | .178* | -.060 | .007 | -.029 |
| 27 | Extraorg Indirect | -.034 | .006 | -.067 | .076 | -.219** | -.110 | -.226** |
| 28 | Extraorg Third Party | .048 | .133 | -.011 | .071 | -.139 | -.004 | -.184* |
| 29 | Extraorg Testing | -.169* | -.060 | -.231** | .069 | .074 | .104 | .023 |
| 30 | Extraorg Disguising Conversations | .091 | .121 | .046 | .076 | -.102 | -.049 | -.069 |
| 31 | Extraorg Observation | .086 | .112 | .057 | .081 | -.167* | -.101 | -.137 |
| 32 | Extraorg Surveillance | .012 | .044 | -.013 | -.014 | -.216** | -.068 | -.246** |

Table 7D (cont'd.)

Correlation Table of Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, and Extraorganizational Types of Information-Seeking

| | | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |
|----|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|------|
| 26 | Extraorg Overt | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 27 | Extraorg Indirect | .471** | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 28 | Extraorg Third Party | .525** | .401** | 1.00 | | | | |
| 29 | Extraorg Testing | .202* | .201* | .148* | 1.00 | | | |
| 30 | Extraorg Disguising Conversations | .512** | .377** | .451** | .142 | 1.00 | | |
| 31 | Extraorg Observation | .491** | .542** | .452** | -.046 | .410** | 1.00 | |
| 32 | Extraorg Surveillance | .275** | .439** | .405** | .101 | .248** | .595** | 1.00 |

* p<.01

** p<.05

subject to measurement artifact or mono-method bias rather than true relationships among the constructs. A principal components analysis with varimax rotation conducted on key variables shows that many of the variables do not load on the same factor, indicating that mono-method bias is not a major limitation of the study. There are 5 factors that resulted from the analysis. Acculturation and total bicultural loaded on the same factor, which is not surprising because the questions were presented in the same measure. Social costs and work support also loaded on this factor. However, work support has fairly strong loadings on three other factors as well. Results are presented in Table 8.

Tests of Hypotheses

Correlational and regression analyses were used to analyze the data using SPSS version 9 for windows. The statistical analysis of each hypothesis is discussed below. As mentioned previously, the hypotheses were initially written to focus on level of biculturalism. Two unidimensional factors of biculturalism emerged. Although a total bicultural score was calculated, the two factors appear to be measuring different aspects of biculturalism. Thus, analyses using the separate subscales were performed in addition to an analysis based on total score. Additionally, hypotheses will be tested with measures of both ethnic identity and acculturation.

Hypothesis 1: The first hypothesis predicts that those high in biculturalism will report experiencing more relational uncertainty than referent and appraisal uncertainty. A chi-square goodness of fit test was used to test this hypothesis. The total biculturalism scale was split at the median breaking the variables into two groups in order to use the

Table 8

Component Analysis of Key Variables in the Study

| | Component | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Uncertainty scenarios | -.002 | .000 | -.007 | .821 | .002 |
| Sex | .004 | -.009 | -.179 | .363 | .711 |
| Age | -.005 | -.113 | -.181 | .214 | -.778 |
| Ethnic ID | .002 | .616 | .133 | .339 | .003 |
| Acculturation | .606 | .237 | -.010 | -.006 | .214 |
| Social Costs | .610 | .385 | .005 | .357 | -.004 |
| Total Learned | .114 | -.128 | .854 | -.008 | .175 |
| Social Support | .004 | .801 | -.002 | -.210 | .002 |
| Work Support | -.459 | .380 | -.388 | -.349 | .007 |
| Total Bicultural | .763 | -.264 | .000 | -.109 | -.004 |
| Information-Seeking Behaviors | -.169 | .265 | .731 | -.000 | -.142 |

analysis. The median group had 9 people and was excluded from the analysis. This hypothesis was supported in the opposite direction. Results are reported in Table 9. High scorers report more task uncertainty and low scorers report more relational uncertainty.

The bounded and conflicted bicultural scales were used to test this hypothesis as well. There was no relationship between bounded and conflicted biculturalism and type of uncertainty reported.

Hypothesis 2: The second hypothesis predicted that those high in biculturalism would report using covert information-seeking strategies, in particular, testing. Hypothesis 2 was not supported, see Table 10 for results. Correlations were first examined for covert information-seeking strategies across situations and testing across situations. There was no relationship between total biculturalism and either covert information seeking or testing.

Next, correlations were examined between total biculturalism and specific covert strategies other than testing. Each strategy was further divided into internal or external usage. Total biculturalism was related to intraorganizational third party information seeking ($r = -.17, p < .05$) and three extraorganizational information-seeking strategies: covert information seeking ($r = -.21, p < .05$), indirect information seeking ($r = -.21, p < .01$) and surveillance information seeking ($r = -.22, p < .01$).

Correlations were then examined using the two biculturalism subscales following the same strategy by first examining covert information-seeking strategies and testing across situations and then examining specific internal and external covert strategies other than testing. There was a negative relationship between bounded

Table 9

Hypothesis 1: Chi-square of Total Biculturalism Score and Uncertainty Reduction

| | Total Bicultural Score | | Total |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------|
| | Low scorers | High scorers | |
| Task (Referent) | 16 | 25 | 41 |
| Appraisal | 6 | 7 | 13 |
| Relational | 14 | 5 | 19 |
| Total | 36 | 37 | 73 |

Pearson chi-square value = 6.44, df = 2, (p<.05)

biculturalism and covert information-seeking strategies ($r = -.17, p < .05$). There was no relationship between bounded biculturalism and testing nor between conflicted biculturalism and covert information seeking.

Bounded biculturalism was related to extraorganizational covert information seeking ($r = -.22, p < .01$). More specifically, bounded biculturalism was related to both intraorganizational ($r = -.21, p < .05$) and extraorganizational third party information seeking ($r = -.18, p < .05$), as well as extraorganizational indirect ($r = -.23, p < .01$) and extraorganizational surveillance ($r = -.25, p < .01$) types of information seeking. Conflicted bicultural was related only to intraorganizational indirect information seeking ($r = .17, p < .05$).

In general, total biculturalism and bounded biculturalism show stronger relationships with specific covert information-seeking strategies than does conflicted biculturalism. Total biculturalism and bounded biculturalism have similar correlational patterns, with bounded biculturalism having only one more significant correlation with extraorganizational third party information seeking.

Significant correlations were also found between ethnic identity and acculturation and types of information seeking. Correlations are presented in Table 10. Ethnic identity total score was correlated positively with intraorganizational surveillance ($r = .16, p < .05$) which can subsequently explained by the exploration subscale which correlated positively with intraorganizational surveillance ($r = .17, p < .05$). Ethnic identity was correlated negatively with extraorganizational testing ($r = -.17, p < .05$), which can be subsequently explained by the affirmation subscale correlation with extraorganizational testing ($r = -.23, p < .01$). The only significant

Table 10

Hypothesis 2: Correlation Matrix of Biculturalism and Covert Information-Seeking Strategies

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| 1 Total Bicultural | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Bounded Bicultural | .90** | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 Conflicted Bicultural | .78** | .45** | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Covert Info-seeking | -.10 | -.17* | .06 | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| 5 Intraorg Third Party | -.17* | -.21* | -.07 | .39** | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 6 Intraorg Indirect | .10 | .05 | .17* | .70** | .22** | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 7 Extraorg Covert | -.21* | -.22** | -.06 | .74** | .19* | .31** | 1.00 | | | | |
| 8 Testing | .00 | -.03 | -.06 | .60** | .15* | .55** | .40** | 1.00 | | | |
| 9 Extraorg Indirect | -.21** | -.23** | -.11 | .55** | .16* | .30** | .73** | .32** | 1.00 | | |
| 10 Extraorg Third Party | -.14 | -.18* | -.00 | .61** | .03 | .21** | .82** | .25** | .40** | 1.00 | |
| 11 Extraorg surveillance | -.22** | -.25** | -.07 | .50** | .27** | .20* | .68** | .23** | .44** | .40** | 1.00 |

** p<.01

* p<.05

Table 10 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 2: Correlation Matrix of Biculturalism and Covert Information-Seeking Strategies

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|-------|-------|--------|------|------|------|
| 1 Ethnic Identity | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 2 Exploration | .91** | 1.00 | | | | |
| 3 Affirmation | .94** | .72** | 1.00 | | | |
| 4 Acculturation | .04 | .13 | -.06 | 1.00 | | |
| 5 Intraorganizational Surveillance Info-seeking | .16* | .17* | .14 | -.01 | 1.00 | |
| 6 Extraorganizational Testing | -.17* | -.06 | -.23** | .07 | -.03 | 1.00 |

correlation for acculturation was positive with extraorganizational overt information seeking ($r = .17, p < .05$).

Hypothesis 3a: Hypothesis 3a predicts that higher biculturalism is associated with greater seeking of intraorganizational sources. This hypothesis was not supported. There was no relationship between total biculturalism and use of intraorganizational sources. Results for hypothesis 3a, 3b and 3c are presented in Table 7. Further, there was no relationship between bounded and conflicted biculturalism and use of intraorganizational sources.

Hypothesis 3b: Hypothesis 3b predicts that higher biculturalism is associated with greater seeking of extraorganizational sources. This hypothesis was supported in the opposite direction. The correlation between total biculturalism and extraorganizational sources was ($r = -.18, p < .05$). Correlations between total biculturalism and the 6 sources of information were then examined. The only source newcomers report using was the external source of family ($r = -.24, p < .01$).

In an additional analysis, respondents who had romantic partners were selected as a subsample to determine if those that have romantic partners are seeking them externally. Those who scored low in total biculturalism sought romantic partners as external sources significantly more than those who scored high in total biculturalism ($r = -.22, p < .05$).

This hypothesis was also examined using bounded and conflicted biculturalism. Conflicted biculturalism was not related to any extraorganizational sources. The correlation between bounded biculturalism and extraorganizational sources was ($r = -.19, p < .05$). The only source newcomers report using was the external source of family

($r = -.29, p < .001$). Those who scored low in bounded biculturalism sought romantic partners as external sources significantly more than those who scored high in bounded biculturalism ($r = -.21, p < .05$).

The correlation between total biculturalism and extraorganizational sources can be explained by the relationship between bounded biculturalism and use of extraorganizational sources. Bounded biculturalism shows a stronger relationship with use of extraorganizational sources than does conflicted biculturalism. The exploration subscale of ethnic identity is correlated positively with seeking coworkers ($r = .15, p < .05$) and family ($r = .21, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 3c: Hypothesis 3c predicts that higher biculturalism is associated with greater seeking of African-American internal and external sources. Hypothesis 3c was not supported. The correlation between sources of the same ethnic background and total biculturalism was significant ($r = -.19, p < .02$) in the negative direction, indicating that low scorers use more African American sources. That correlation can subsequently be explained by the significant correlation between seeking intraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background and total biculturalism ($r = -.16, p < .05$). The correlation between extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background and total biculturalism was not significant.

There were also significant correlations between bounded and conflicted biculturalism and use of sources of the same ethnic background. The correlation between sources of the same ethnic background and bounded biculturalism was significant ($r = -.29, p < .02$) in the negative direction, indicating that low scorers use more African American sources. That correlation can subsequently be explained by the

significant correlation between seeking intraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background and bounded biculturalism ($r = -.18, p < .05$). The correlation between extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background and bounded biculturalism was not significant.

Conflicted biculturals followed a similar pattern. The correlation between sources of the same ethnic background and conflicted biculturalism was significant ($r = -.32, p < .001$) in the negative direction indicating that low scorers use more African American sources. Again, that correlation can be explained by the significant correlation between seeking intraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background and conflicted biculturalism ($r = -.34, p < .001$). The correlation between extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background and conflicted biculturalism was not significant.

All three measures of biculturalism exhibit a similar correlational pattern with conflicted biculturalism having the strongest relationship with overall use of African American sources and intraorganizational African American sources. There is a significant correlation between use of extraorganizational African-American sources and the ethnic identity scale ($r = .16, p < .05$) which can subsequently be explained by the exploration subscale ($r = .21, p < .01$). In addition, there is also a significant correlation between use of extraorganizational African-American sources and the acculturation scale ($r = .19, p < .05$).

Hypothesis 4a: Hypothesis 4a predicts that higher perceived social costs are associated with greater use of covert information-seeking strategies rather than overt information-seeking strategies. Hypothesis 4a was not supported as indicated by an

examination of correlations. The correlations between perceived social costs and intraorganizational overt information seeking ($r = -.16, p < .05$), perceived social costs and extraorganizational overt information seeking ($r = .31, p < .001$), and perceived social costs and extraorganizational disguising conversations information-seeking ($r = .22, p < .01$) are all significant. Those who perceive high social costs are using more extraorganizational disguising conversations than those who perceive lower social costs. Those who perceive high social costs are also seeking more information outside the organization than those who perceive lower social costs, but they are seeking it overtly.

Hypothesis 4b: Hypothesis 4b predicts that higher perceived social costs are associated with greater use of extraorganizational sources than intraorganizational sources. The second part of this hypothesis predicts that when newcomers perceive high social costs, they will not seek information from intraorganizational sources. Correlations were examined for this hypothesis. Hypothesis 4b was supported. The correlations between perceived social costs and both extraorganizational and intraorganizational sources were examined. Only the correlation between extraorganizational sources and perceived social costs was significant, ($r = .19, p < .05$) indicating that those that perceive high social costs are depending on extraorganizational sources for information.

Hypothesis 4c: Hypothesis 4c predicts that high biculturalism is associated with high perceived social costs. Correlations were examined for this hypothesis. The correlation between total biculturalism and perceived social costs ($r = .26, p < .01$) was

significant. Thus, those high in total biculturalism perceive higher social costs than those low in total biculturalism.

Significant correlations between bounded and conflicted biculturalism and perceived social costs were also found. The correlations between bounded and perceived social costs ($r = .23, p < .01$) and conflicted biculturals and perceived social costs ($r = .25, p < .01$) were significant. Thus, both high bounded and conflicted biculturals perceive high social costs.

In addition, perceived social costs was correlated with ethnic identity ($r = .18, p < .05$) which can subsequently be explained by the correlation with exploration ($r = .22, p < .01$). Acculturation was correlated positively with perceived social costs ($r = .30, p < .001$).

The pattern of results thus far suggests that biculturalism has the most influence on the socialization process. However, the bicultural factor, including the total scale and subscale, must be interpreted in reverse mode. Once considering the factor in reverse, then the results can be considered complementary with the formulated hypotheses.

Hypothesis 5a: Hypothesis 5a predicts that perceived social costs will moderate the relationship between one's level of biculturalism and the type of information-seeking strategy used. Specifically, when perceived social costs are high, those high in biculturalism will be more likely to use covert information-seeking strategies than when the perceived social costs are low. This hypothesis was partially supported. The dependent variables for information-seeking strategy were intraorganizational and extraorganizational covert information seeking and intraorganizational and

extraorganizational overt information seeking. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis. At step 1, perceived social costs and total biculturalism were entered simultaneously as a predictor set. At step 2, the cross-product of the two variables was entered.

Results are shown in Table 11. Note that there are many regression equations that comprise the testing of hypotheses 5a and 5b. In an effort to conserve space, only significant steps in the regression will be displayed in tables. A significant main effect was found for total biculturalism (beta $-.26$, $p < .01$) indicating that it predicts extraorganizational covert information-seeking behavior. Five percent of the variance in extraorganizational covert information-seeking is accounted for by total biculturalism. The total bicultural and perceived social costs interaction was not significant; therefore, no moderator effects were found for extraorganizational covert information-seeking and are not reported. In addition, for the total bicultural and perceived social costs model predicting extraorganizational overt information-seeking, only a main effect was found for perceived social costs (beta $.30$, $p < .001$).

Table 11

Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Total Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Information-Seeking Strategy

Extraorganizational Covert Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | P |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .07 | .05 | .07 | 4.225 | .02 |
| Perceived social costs | .17 | | | | | |
| Total Biculturalism | -.26* | | | | | |

* p<.05

Extraorganizational Overt Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | P |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .09 | .07 | .09 | 5.382 | .01 |
| Perceived social costs | .30*** | | | | | |
| Total Biculturalism | -.14 | | | | | |

*** p<.001

A significant total bicultural and perceived social costs interaction, accounting for four percent of the variance, was found in predicting intraorganizational overt information-seeking ($t = -2.09, p < .05$). The significant interaction indicates that perceived social costs moderates the relationship between total biculturalism and intraorganizational overt information-seeking behavior. The negative beta weight indicates that as those low in total biculturalism perceive fewer social costs, they use more intraorganizational overt information-seeking. No significant effects were found for intraorganizational covert information-seeking. Results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Total Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Intraorganizational Information-Seeking Strategy

Intraorganizational Overt Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R² | Adjusted R² | Change in R² | F | p | F Change | (F Change) p |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Step 1: | | .03 | .01 | .03 | 1.401 | .251 | | |
| Total Bicultural | -.08 | | | | | | | |
| Perceived social costs | -.12 | | | | | | | |
| Step 2: | | .06 | .04 | .04 | 2.419 | .07 | 4.371 | .04 |
| Total Biculturalism x Perceived social costs | -.20* | | | | | | | |

* p<.05

Subsequently, bounded and conflicted biculturalism were examined as predictors in examining the type of information-seeking strategy used. The dependant variables for information-seeking strategy were the same as discussed above. Again, hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis. At step 1, perceived social costs and bounded bicultural were entered simultaneously as a predictor set. At step 2, the cross-product of the two variables was entered.

Results are shown in Table 13. Significant main effects were found for bounded bicultural (beta -0.27 , $p < .005$) and perceived social costs (beta $.19$, $p < .05$), indicating that they predict extraorganizational covert information-seeking behavior. Seven percent of the variance in extraorganizational covert information-seeking is accounted for by bounded bicultural and perceived social costs. The bounded bicultural and perceived social costs interaction was not significant; therefore, no moderator effects were found for extraorganizational covert information-seeking and are not reported. In addition, for the bounded bicultural and perceived social costs model predicting extraorganizational overt information-seeking, only a main effect was found for perceived social costs (beta $.30$, $p < .001$).

Table 13

Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Bounded Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Information-Seeking Strategy

Extraorganizational Covert Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | P |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|
| Step 1: | | .08 | .07 | .08 | 5.12 | .007 |
| Perceived social costs | .19 | | | | | |
| Bounded Biculturalism | -.27** | | | | | |

** p<.01
* p<.05

Extraorganizational Overt Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | P |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .09 | .07 | .09 | 5.427 | .006 |
| Perceived social costs | .30*** | | | | | |
| Bounded Biculturalism | -.10 | | | | | |

***p<.001

Conflicted bicultural was entered the same way as bounded bicultural. At step 1, perceived social costs and conflicted bicultural were entered simultaneously as a predictor set. At step 2, the cross-product of the two variables was entered. For conflicted bicultural, there were significant cross-products for intraorganizational overt and intraorganizational covert information-seeking. The significant interaction indicates that perceived social costs do moderate the relationship between conflicted bicultural and intraorganizational overt ($t = -3.67, p < .001$) and intraorganizational covert ($t = -3.07, p < .01$) information-seeking. The negative beta weights indicate that when those low in conflicted biculturalism perceive low social costs they use more intraorganizational covert and overt information-seeking. Results are reported in Table 14.

In addition, in the conflicted bicultural and perceived social costs model predicting extraorganizational overt information-seeking, a significant main effect was found for perceived social costs ($\beta = .32, p < .001$). Results are shown in Table 14A.

Table 14

Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Intraorganizational Information-Seeking Strategy

Intraorganizational Overt Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p | F Change | (F Change) p |
|---|----------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|----------|--------------|
| Step 1: | | .02 | .004 | .02 | 1.246 | .291 | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | -.03 | | | | | | | |
| Perceived social costs | -.14 | | | | | | | |
| Step 2 | | .12 | .10 | .10 | 5.4 | .002 | 13.445 | .000 |
| Conflicted Bicultural x Perceived social costs | -.341*** | | | | | | | |

*** p<.001

Table 14 (cont'd.)

Intraorganizational Covert Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p | F Change | (F Change) p |
|---|--------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|----------|--------------|
| Step 1: | | .02 | .004 | .02 | 1.248 | .291 | 1.248 | .291 |
| Conflicted Bicultural Perceived social costs | .054 .122 | | | | | | | |
| Step 2: | | .10 | .07 | .07 | 4.023 | .009 | 9.393 | .003 |
| Conflicted Bicultural x Perceived social costs | -.290*** | | | | | | | |

*** p<.001

Table 14A

Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Information-Seeking Strategy

Extraorganizational Overt Information-Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R² | Adjusted R² | Change in R² | F | p |
|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Step 1: | | .10 | .08 | .10 | 6.166 | .003 |
| Perceived social costs | .32*** | | | | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | -.09 | | | | | |

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

Ethnic identity, exploration and affirmation were examined separately as predictors in examining the type of information-seeking strategy used. The dependant variables for information-seeking strategy were the same as discussed above. Again, hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis. At step 1, each respective predictor was entered simultaneously with perceived social costs as a predictor set. At step 2, the cross-product of the two variables was entered.

Results are shown in Table 15. Significant main effects were found only for perceived social costs with each of the three respective predictors, indicating that perceived social costs predicts extraorganizational overt information-seeking behavior. Eight to ten percent of the variance in extraorganizational overt information-seeking is accounted for by perceived social costs in each of the equations. None of the interactions were significant; therefore, no moderator effects were found for extraorganizational overt information-seeking and are not reported.

In addition, an acculturation and perceived social costs model predicting extraorganizational overt information-seeking was tested. Again, only a main effect was found for perceived social costs (beta .30, $p < .01$), accounting for 8 percent of the variance. Results are reported in Table 15A. The interaction was not significant is not reported.

Table 15

Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regressions Ethnic Identity/Exploration and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information Seeking Strategy

Ethnic Identity and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .11 | .09 | .11 | 6.657 | .002 |
| Perceived social costs | .33*** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Identity | -.03 | | | | | |

*** p<.001

Exploration and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .10 | .08 | .10 | 6.324 | .002 |
| Perceived social costs | .30*** | | | | | |
| Exploration | .04 | | | | | |

*** p<.001

Table 15A

Hypothesis 5a: Hierarchical Regressions of Affirmation/Acculturation and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information Seeking Strategy

Affirmation and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .11 | .10 | .11 | 7.039 | .001 |
| Perceived social costs | .33*** | | | | | |
| Affirmation | -.08 | | | | | |

*** p<.001

Acculturation and Perceived Social Costs on Extraorganizational Overt Information Seeking

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .10 | .08 | .10 | 5.151 | .01 |
| Perceived social costs | .26** | | | | | |
| Acculturation | .11 | | | | | |

** p<.01

Hypothesis 5b: Hypothesis 5b predicts that perceived social costs will moderate the relationship between one's level of biculturalism and the source sought for information. Specifically, when perceived social costs are high, those high in biculturalism will be more likely to seek extraorganizational sources than when the perceived social costs are low. The dependant variables were intraorganizational and extraorganizational sources, intraorganizational and extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background as well as supervisor, coworker, direct report, romantic partner, family and friends. Predictors were entered the same way as above, with perceived social costs and total biculturalism entered simultaneously at step 1, followed by the interaction variable at step 2.

Significant main effects were found for extraorganizational sources, both intraorganizational and extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background, family and friends. Total biculturalism (beta $-.24$, $p < .01$) and perceived social costs (beta $.22$, $p < .05$) predicted reported use extraorganizational sources and account for six percent of the variance. No moderator effects were found and are not reported. All results are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Total Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source**Extraorganizational Sources**

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .08 | .06 | .08 | 4.769 | .01 |
| Perceived social costs | .22* | | | | | |
| Total Biculturalism | -.24** | | | | | |

** p<.01

* p<.05

Intraorganizational Sources – Same Ethnic Background

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .09 | .07 | .09 | 5.381 | .01 |
| Perceived social costs | .25** | | | | | |
| Total Biculturalism | -.24** | | | | | |

**p<.01

Table 16 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Total Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source**Extraorganizational Sources - Same Ethnic Background**

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|---------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .08 | .06 | .08 | 4.651 | .01 |
| Perceived social costs | .25** | | | | | |
| Total Bicultural | -.20* | | | | | |
| **p<.01 | | | | | | |
| *p<.01 | | | | | | |
| Family | | | | | | |
| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | P |
| Step 1: | | .12 | .10 | .12 | 7.366 | .001 |
| Perceived social costs | .27** | | | | | |
| Total Bicultural | -.35*** | | | | | |
| ***p<.001 | | | | | | |
| ** p<.01 | | | | | | |
| Friends | | | | | | |
| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | P |
| Step 1: | | .06 | .04 | .06 | 3.349 | .05 |
| Perceived social costs | .22* | | | | | |
| Total Bicultural | -.16 | | | | | |
| *p<.05 | | | | | | |

Bounded and conflicted biculturalism were examined next. For the bounded bicultural and perceived social costs model, significant main effects were found for extraorganizational sources, extraorganizational and intraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background, family and friends. In predicting seeking extraorganizational sources for information, significant main effects were found for perceived social costs (beta .23, $p < .001$) and bounded bicultural (beta -.24, $p < .001$). Results are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Bounded Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source

Extraorganizational Sources

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .09 | .07 | .09 | 5.357 | .006 |
| Perceived social costs | .23** | | | | | |
| Bounded Bicultural | -.24** | | | | | |

**p<.01

Intraorganizational Sources of the Same Ethnic Background

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .09 | .08 | .09 | 5.715 | .004 |
| Perceived social costs | .25** | | | | | |
| Bounded Bicultural | -.24** | | | | | |

**p<.01

Extraorganizational Sources of the Same Ethnic Background

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .09 | .07 | .09 | 5.196 | .007 |
| Perceived social costs | .27** | | | | | |
| Bounded Bicultural | -.19* | | | | | |

**p<.01
* p<.05

Table 17 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Bounded Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source**Family**

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|---------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|------|
| Step 1: | | .15 | .14 | .15 | 10.016 | .000 |
| Perceived social costs | .27*** | | | | | |
| Bounded Biculturalism | -.35*** | | | | | |

*** p<.001

Friends

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .06 | .04 | .06 | 3.468 | .04 |
| Perceived social costs | .23** | | | | | |
| Bounded Biculturalism | -.14 | | | | | |

*p<.01

The conflicted bicultural model was next tested. Predictors were entered the same way as above, with perceived social costs and conflicted bicultural entered simultaneously at step 1, followed by the interaction variable at step 2. For the conflicted bicultural and perceived social costs model, a significant interaction was found for intraorganizational sources ($t=-3.41$, $p<.001$), supervisor ($t=-2.77$, $p<.01$), and coworker ($t=-2.94$, $p<.01$). Thus, perceived social costs moderates the relationship between conflicted bicultural and intraorganizational sources, accounting for eight percent of the variance in intraorganizational sources. Five percent of the variance is accounted for in the supervisor model and seven percent of the variance is accounted for in the coworker model. Results are in Table 18. The beta weights for each of the interactions is negative, indicating that as those low in conflicted biculturalism perceive fewer social costs, they seek intraorganizational sources, particularly supervisors and coworkers.

In addition, significant main effect for perceived social costs were found in predicting seeking friends for information (beta .22, $p<.05$), and use of intraorganizational and extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background (beta .21, $p<.05$; beta .23, $p<.05$, respectively).

Table 18

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source

Intraorganizational Sources

| Variable | Beta | R² | Adjusted R² | Change in R² | F | p | F Change | (F Change) p |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Step 1: | | .008 | -.009 | .008 | .457 | .635 | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | .038 | | | | | | | |
| Perceived social costs | .070 | | | | | | | |
| Step 2: | | .10 | .08 | .10 | 4.196 | .007 | 11.592 | .001 |
| Conflicted Bicultural x Perceived social costs | -.321*** | | | | | | | |

***** p<.001**

Table 18 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source

Supervisor

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p | F Change | (F Change) p |
|---|---------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|----------|--------------|
| Step 1: | | .016 | .000 | .016 | .981 | .378 | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | .110 | | | | | | | |
| Perceived social costs | .044 | | | | | | | |
| Step 2: | | .08 | .05 | .06 | 3.248 | .02 | 7.671 | .007 |
| Conflicted Bicultural x Perceived social costs | -.264** | | | | | | | |

** p<.01

Table 18 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source

Coworker

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p | F Change | (F Change) p |
|---|---------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|----------|--------------|
| Step 1: | | .003 | -.01 | .003 | .199 | .82 | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | .011 | | | | | | | |
| Perceived social costs | .054 | | | | | | | |
| Step 2: | | .07 | .05 | .07 | 3.019 | .03 | 8.632 | .004 |
| Conflicted Bicultural x Perceived social costs | -.280** | | | | | | | |

** p<.01

Table 18 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source

Friends

| Variable | Beta | R² | Adjusted R² | Change in R² | F | p |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Step 1: | | .05 | .03 | .05 | 3.122 | .05 |
| Perceived social costs | .22* | | | | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | -.13 | | | | | |

***p<.05**

Intraorganizational Sources of the Same Ethnic Background

| Variable | Beta | R² | Adjusted R² | Change in R² | F | p |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Step 1: | | .05 | .03 | .05 | 3.079 | .05 |
| Perceived social costs | .21* | | | | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | -.15 | | | | | |

*** p<.05**

Table 18 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Conflicted Biculturalism and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source

Extraorganizational Sources of the Same Ethnic Background

| Variable | Beta | R² | Adjusted R² | Change in R² | F | p |
|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Step 1: | | .05 | .03 | .05 | 3.064 | .05 |
| Perceived social costs | .23** | | | | | |
| Conflicted Bicultural | -.09 | | | | | |

****p<.01**

NOTE TO USERS

**Page(s) missing in number only; text follows.
Microfilmed as received.**

138

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

The ethnic identity, exploration, affirmation and acculturation models were tested. Predictors were entered the same way as above, with perceived social costs and each respective predictor entered simultaneously at step 1, followed by the interaction variable at step 2. For the ethnic identity and perceived social costs model, a significant main effect was found for extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background as well as family and friends, accounting for seven and six percent of the variance, respectively. Results are in Table 19.

Table 19

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Ethnic Identity and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source**Extraorganizational Sources of the Same Ethnic Background**

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .07 | .05 | .07 | 4.020 | .02 |
| Perceived social costs | .23** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Identity | .09 | | | | | |

**p<.01

Family

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .06 | .04 | .06 | 3.481 | .03 |
| Perceived social costs | .18* | | | | | |
| Ethnic Identity | .13 | | | | | |

* p<.05

Friends

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .05 | .04 | .05 | 3.161 | .05 |
| Perceived social costs | .23** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Identity | -.08 | | | | | |

**p<.01

Results for the other models are similar. For the exploration and perceived social costs model, a significant main effect was found for extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background accounting for eight percent of the variance. A significant main effect was also found for family. However, an examination of the beta weights indicates that none of the beta weights are significant suggesting multicollinearity among the predictors. Results are in Table 20.

For the affirmation and perceived social costs model, a significant main effect was found for extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background accounting for four percent of the variance. A significant main effect was also found for family, accounting for five percent of the variance. Results are in Table 20A. For the acculturation and perceived social costs model, nothing was significant.

Table 20

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Exploration and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source

Extraorganizational Sources of the Same Ethnic Background

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .08 | .06 | .08 | 4.920 | .01 |
| Perceived social costs | .19* | | | | | |
| Exploration | .16 | | | | | |

**p<.05

Table 20A

Hypothesis 5b: Hierarchical Regression of Affirmation and Perceived Social Costs on Information Source**Extraorganizational Sources of the Same Ethnic Background**

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | P |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .06 | .04 | .06 | 3.579 | .03 |
| Perceived social costs | .24** | | | | | |
| Affirmation | .03 | | | | | |

**p<.01

Friend

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|------------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .06 | .05 | .06 | 3.817 | .03 |
| Perceived social costs | .23** | | | | | |
| Affirmation | -.13 | | | | | |

** p<.01

Hypothesis 6: Hypothesis 6 predicts that high biculturalism is associated with greater learning about relationships at work. Correlations were examined to test this hypothesis. It was not supported. Those high in total biculturalism learn more about satisfactory ($r = .17$, $p < .05$) and non-satisfactory ($r = .16$, $p < .05$) sources of support outside of work and self appraisal ($r = .18$, $p < .05$).

In addition, those high in bounded biculturalism learn more about satisfactory ($r = .15$, $p < .05$) and non-satisfactory ($r = .15$, $p < .05$) sources of support outside of work. Those high in conflicted biculturalism report learning more about self-appraisal than do those who have low scores ($r = .18$, $p < .05$).

The exploration subscale is correlated positively with learning about the nature of relationships at work, ($r = .19$, $p < .01$) and learning more about satisfactory sources of support outside work ($r = .20$, $p < .01$). Acculturation is correlated negatively with learning about satisfactory sources of support at work ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$).

Secondary Analyses

In an attempt to better understand some of the findings, correlations between ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism and social support as well as support at work were examined. Correlations are presented in Table 21. Ethnic identity was correlated with family social support ($r = .20$, $p < .05$, 2-tailed), which can be subsequently explained by the affirmation subscale correlation with family social support ($r = .29$, $p < .01$, 2-tailed). Bounded biculturalism was correlated with family social support ($r = -.26$, $p < .01$, 2-tailed) as well as

Table 21

Hypothesis 6: Correlation Matrix for Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, Social Support and Social Support at Work

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------|
| Ethnic ID | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| Identity Search | .907** | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| Identity Affect | .943** | .716** | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Acculturation | .043 | .127 | -.032 | 1.00 | | | | |
| Total Bicultural | -.042 | .088 | -.148 | .248* | 1.00 | | | |
| Conflict Bicultural | -.036 | .094 | .131 | .218* | .783** | 1.00 | | |
| Bounded Bicultural | -.038 | .050 | -.115 | .192* | .899** | .449** | 1.00 | |
| Family Support | .196* | .057 | .285** | .018 | -.259** | -.119 | -.255** | 1.00 |
| Friend Support | | | | | | | | |
| Other Support | | | | | | | | |
| Total Support | | | | | | | | |
| Work Support | | | | | | | | |

Table 21 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 6: Correlation Matrix for Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, Social Support and Social Support at Work

| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| Ethnic ID | .103 | .107 | .186 | .041 |
| Identity Search | .093 | .041 | .086 | -.033 |
| Identity Affect | .134 | .122 | .247** | .078 |
| Acculturation | .028 | .110 | .070 | -.144 |
| Total Bicultural | -.171 | .022 | -.179 | -.222* |
| Conflict Bicultural | -.126 | .053 | -.082 | -.140 |
| Bounded Bicultural | -.147 | .014 | -.170 | -.232* |
| Family Support | .185* | .254** | .683* | .080 |

Table 21 (cont'd.)

Hypothesis 6: Correlation Matrix for Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, Biculturalism, Social Support and Social Support at Work

| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|----------------|--------|--------|------|------|
| Friend Support | 1.00 | | | |
| Other Support | .402** | 1.00 | | |
| Total Support | .683** | .791** | 1.00 | |
| Work Support | -.006 | -.005 | .045 | 1.00 |

* $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

receiving the social support desired at work ($r = -.23, p < .01, 2\text{-tailed}$). These correlations indicate that those who score high in bounded biculturalism feel they do not receive much social support from their families and do not receive as much social support as they desire at work.

Whether one learns the information sought during the socialization process is critical to a new hires' tenure with the organization. A research question was whether learning was associated with particular information-seeking strategies, sources and biculturalism level.

First, correlational patterns were examined. Correlations are presented in Appendix O. Rather than focus on all of the types of learning, I chose to look at learning about relationships and sources of support. Based on the literature review, a key determinant of success for African Americans is the ability to form networks and supportive relationships. It was not clear whether and how biculturalism level, source sought and strategy used combined would impact learning. Thus, a backwards regression method was used for 5 types of learning: nature of relationships at work, satisfactory support outside work, satisfactory support at work, non-satisfactory support outside work and non-satisfactory support at work. In a backwards regression procedure, all variables are entered into the regression equation and then removed sequentially based on the smallest partial correlation with the dependant variable. Results are presented in Table 22.

Most of the variables that best predicted learning about relationships involved covert information-seeking strategies. Interestingly, however, the variable that best predicted learning satisfactory support at work was intraorganizational overt information seeking. Total and bounded biculturalism were also predictors in three types of learning. Total bicultural,

friends and intraorganizational surveillance accounted for 14% of the variance in learning satisfactory support outside work. Bounded bicultural, extraorganizational surveillance information seeking and intraorganizational indirect information-seeking accounted for 23% of the variance in learning non-satisfactory support outside work. Bounded bicultural and intraorganizational surveillance information seeking accounted for 20% of the variance in learning the nature of relationships at work.

Table 22

Secondary Analysis: Backwards Regression of Biculturalism Level, Information-Seeking Strategy and Source on Learning

Learn Satisfactory Support at Work

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|---|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .09 | .08 | .09 | 10.396 | .01 |
| Intraorganizational overt information seeking | .30** | | | | | |
| ** p<.01 | | | | | | |

Learn Nature of Relationships at Work

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|--|---------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .22 | .20 | .18 | 14.908 | .00 |
| Intraorganizational surveillance seeking | ..43*** | | | | | |
| Bounded Biculturalism | .20** | | | | | |
| *** p<.001 | | | | | | |
| ** p<.01 | | | | | | |

Table 22 (cont'd.)

Secondary Analysis: Backwards Regression of Biculturalism Level, Information-Seeking Strategy and Source on Learning

Learn Satisfactory Support Outside Work

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|---|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
| Step 1: | | .16 | .14 | .05 | 7.044 | .000 |
| Intraorganizational surveillance seeking | .23** | | | | | |
| Friends | .23** | | | | | |
| Total Biculturalism | .22** | | | | | |
| ** p<.01 | | | | | | |

Learn Non-Satisfactory Support at Work

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|---|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|
| Step 1: | | .07 | .07 | .07 | 8.842 | .01 |
| Intraorganizational 3rd party seeking | .27** | | | | | |
| ** p<.01 | | | | | | |

Table 22 (cont'd.)

Secondary Analysis: Backwards Regression of Biculturalism Level, Information-Seeking Strategy and Source on Learning

Learn Non-Satisfactory Support Outside Work

| Variable | Beta | R ² | Adjusted R ² | Change in R ² | F | p |
|---|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|------|
| Step 1: | | .23 | .21 | .05 | 10.847 | .000 |
| Intraorganizational indirect seeking | .32*** | | | | | |
| Extraorganizational surveillance seeking | .27*** | | | | | |
| Bounded Biculturalism | .22** | | | | | |

*** p<.01
** p<.01

Summary of Results

Overall, the biculturalism construct is most strongly related to each of the dependant variables. In most cases, it is the subscales of bounded and conflicted biculturalism that explain the relationship that total biculturalism has with the dependent variables. Specific hypothesis findings will be summarized below.

Hypothesis 1 was not supported. Rather, it is the low bicultural scorers who experience more relational uncertainty than task and appraisal uncertainty. Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Biculturalism is related to covert information-seeking behavior, however, not testing. Specifically, bounded biculturalism is related negatively to the following information-seeking strategies: intraorganizational and extraorganizational third party, extraorganizational indirect and extraorganizational surveillance. In addition, the ethnic identity subscale, exploration, is correlated positively with intraorganizational surveillance while the affirmation subscale is correlated negatively with extraorganizational testing.

Hypothesis 3, that higher biculturalism is associated with greater seeking of intraorganizational sources, was not supported. It was found, in the opposite direction, that low bounded bicultural scorers sought more extraorganizational sources than high bounded bicultural scorers did. Specifically, they seek family and romantic partners. In addition, there is a positive correlation between exploring ethnic identity and seeking coworkers and family. Low scoring total, bounded and conflicted biculturals seek more African-American sources, particularly internal African-American sources. Use of extraorganizational African-American sources is correlated positively with those who

have explored their ethnic identity as well as those who are more traditional as measured by the acculturation scale.

Hypothesis 4, that perceived social costs are correlated with covert information-seeking strategies, did not receive support. Only one of the correlations among the six covert strategies was significant: extraorganizational disguising conversations. It was also found that higher perceived social costs are associated with less use of intraorganizational overt information-seeking and more extraorganizational overt information seeking.

High perceived social costs is correlated with use of extraorganizational sources. In addition, high perceived social costs is correlated positively with total biculturalism and both the bounded and conflicted subscales, indicating that both high bounded and conflicted biculturals perceive high social costs. Perceived social costs is also correlated with the ethnic identity scale, which can subsequently be explained by the correlation with the exploration subscale. Acculturation was also correlated positively with perceived social costs.

Perceived social costs was examined as a moderator between one's level of biculturalism and both information-seeking strategy used and sources sought for information. In predicting use of extraorganizational covert information seeking, separate significant main effects were found for total biculturalism, bounded biculturalism and perceived social costs. A significant main effect was also found for perceived social costs in predicting use of extraorganizational overt information seeking.

Perceived social costs moderates the relationship between conflicted biculturalism and both intraorganizational overt and covert information seeking. Perceived social costs is also a moderator of the total biculturalism and intraorganizational overt information-seeking, but the conflicted bicultural model accounts for more of the variance than the total bicultural model. And because total and conflicted biculturalism are so highly correlated, the conflicted model is the more appropriate one. The negative beta weight indicates that who are low in conflicted biculturalism perceive fewer social costs, they use intraorganizational overt and covert information seeking.

The results of the perceived social costs moderating the relationship between biculturalism level and source of information were fairly similar across sources. Significant main effects were found for total biculturalism and perceived social costs (in the same model) for extraorganizational sources, intraorganizational sources and extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background, family, and friends. A similar pattern of results was found with bounded biculturalism and perceived social costs (in the same model) predicting the above-mentioned variables.

The interaction between conflicted biculturalism and perceived social costs predicted the use of intraorganizational sources, particularly supervisor and coworker use. The negative beta weights indicate that those who are low in biculturalism perceive fewer social costs, they seek intraorganizational sources, particularly supervisors and coworkers.

Hypothesis 6, that high biculturalism is associated with greater learning about relationships at work, was not supported. Those high in total biculturalism and

subsequently, bounded biculturalism, report learning more about satisfactory and non-satisfactory sources of support outside of work. Those high in total biculturalism and subsequently, conflicted biculturalism, report learning more about self-appraisal than do those who have low scores. It is the exploration subscale that correlated positively with learning about the nature of relationships at work and about satisfactory sources of support outside work. Acculturation is correlated negatively with learning about satisfactory sources of support at work.

Chapter 8

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of African-American ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism level during the organizational socialization process. More specifically, the strategies that newcomers use when seeking information and those to whom they turn for information were examined. Finally, because organizational socialization has been defined as a learning process (e.g., Schein, 1968; Fisher, 1986), this study considered whether African Americans learn through the information they seek. Each of these areas will be discussed followed by implications and contributions of the study. Finally, limitations and directions for future research are considered.

Ethnic Identity and Acculturation

Overall, the results indicate that ethnic identity, acculturation and biculturalism are related to organizational socialization. However, ethnic identity and acculturation are only related to very limited aspects of socialization and do not appear to have very much influence in the socialization process. It is the biculturalism variable that is related to many aspects of seeking information during the organizational socialization process.

Biculturalism

The bicultural measure developed specifically for this study appears to measure two aspects of biculturalism. One can be described as measuring external conflict and is currently called bounded biculturalism. It measures behaviors in which African Americans engage at work as they struggle to define themselves as members of the

African-American group. The second factor measures internal conflict and is named conflicted biculturalism. This factor measures the internal struggle or strife people feel as they are pulled between two places or cultures.

The original conceptualization of the measure was that high scorers on the bicultural measures would feel high internal conflict and would in turn exhibit this in their behavior. I conceptualized this group as the effectively bicultural group. Those low in total and bounded biculturalism were just ignoring or unaware of any impact being African American in the organization meant to them. However, the overall pattern of results, including that low scorers report more relational uncertainty, indicated that I had to alter my thinking in interpreting the biculturalism factor.

It is likely those who score low in my bicultural measure have adopted biculturalism as an effective strategy. They have developed their skills and behaviors to such an extent that they are not concerned outwardly about behaving differently around European Americans and African Americans, they do not have to compartmentalize their lives and they really do not feel inner conflict. They are no longer struggling to decide what being bicultural means to them. They have worked through the conflict to develop an effective strategy. They are the group that is more aware of the importance of relationships, seeking African American sources of support and finally finding social support inside and outside the organization. They tend to seek more external sources of support, such as family, friends and romantic partners, than those who are not as comfortable yet.

Thus, it would mean that those who have adopted biculturalism as an effective strategy are more aware of the importance of networks and they perceive

slightly lower social costs because they have more social support than those who were high scorers. The high scorers are still experiencing more conflict both internally and externally. They are concerned about their behavior, they seek to understand how they are performing, and they experience high conflict between their two worlds.

However, the low to moderate correlations and small amount of variance accounted for in the regressions using biculturalism imply that while these variables are related, they are only part of the more complicated process of organizational socialization. Yet the pattern of results starts to paint a picture of how biculturalism impacts aspects the organizational socialization process.

The measure I have created is a good beginning. At this point, I hesitate to place a value judgement on whether people who are high or low in either bounded or conflicted biculturalism are better. It is similar to Cross' suggestion that perhaps identity does not develop " ... so much from negative to positive, as from low salience to high salience, apolitical to political, Eurocentric to Afrocentric, positive and healthy involvement in organizations that did not stress Blackness to healthy and positive activism in organizations that give high priority to being Black" (Cross, 1991, p.174). The focus is not on healthy psychological development, but rather on developing one's black identity without a judgment in defining a healthy psyche.

In a parallel argument, perhaps biculturalism is really about developing coping mechanisms for success at work. Biculturalism as measured with this scale in this study is about adopting a strategy to survive and succeed at work. The bounded biculturalism factor emphasizes compartmentalizing one's work and personal lives as well as being conscious of one's behavior at work, even to the point of behaving differently around

different groups of people. The conflicted factor emphasizes the discomfort and struggle one feels straddling two worlds and representing African Americans in a white world. Is it not clear if through this strategy they are able to avoid some of the stress associated with this lifestyle or if stress is increased because of the awareness of how the two cultures are so different.

Organizational Socialization Information Seeking and Sources

This study further advances the knowledge of the organizational socialization process. Research to date has only studied European Americans with the exception of the Teboul study. However, the Teboul study focused on ascribed racial/ethnic group differences rather than identity. Results indicate that biculturalism is related to various information-seeking strategies and choice of source.

Biculturalism, particularly bounded biculturalism, was related to the types of information-seeking strategies utilized. Those high in biculturalism were less likely to report using extraorganizational covert information-seeking strategies including indirect, surveillance and third party. It was the biculturalism measure, again mostly bounded, that was related to sources sought. The high scorers report seeking few extraorganizational sources, including family and romantic partners. Internally, they report seeking few African-American sources.

Prior to reinterpreting the biculturalism scale, I looked at the effect of social support on type of information-seeking strategy sought. Having social support inside and outside the organization is one of the criteria in LaFromboise's model in becoming effectively bicultural. Social support also makes people feel safer to seek information because they perceive lower social costs. It does appear that social support perceptions

are affecting choices in information seeking. The individuals who are high in biculturalism perceive low levels of social support from family as well as from supervisors and coworkers in the work environment. This finding is aligned with the reinterpretation of the biculturalism scale. Those who are high in biculturalism are experiencing conflict in their biculturalism.

Perceived Social Costs

The findings in this study about perceived social costs support what is already in the literature. When newcomers perceive the social cost of seeking information as low, they are more likely to use overt information-seeking strategies. When newcomers perceive high social costs, they will still seek information overtly, but from extraorganizational sources like romantic partners and friends (Teboul, 1995). This study found that when perceived social costs were high, individuals reported using less intraorganizational overt information seeking and more extraorganizational overt information seeking. In addition, people reported seeking more extraorganizational sources, particularly friends and family when they perceived high social costs. It was those high in biculturalism that report higher perceived social costs.

Perceived social costs predicted the use of extraorganizational covert information-seeking strategy as well. It was perceived social costs and bounded biculturalism that predicted the use of extraorganizational sources. Further analysis showed that the use of intraorganizational and extraorganizational sources of the same ethnic background were predicted by perceived social costs and bounded biculturalism. Perceived social costs and bounded biculturalism related also to the use of family as an external source; however, only perceived social costs predicted the use of friends as an

external source. Thus, perceived social costs is the key variable in predicting use of extraorganizational strategy and source. In some cases, bounded biculturalism predict the use of extraorganizational source and strategy.

Learning

Those high in total and bounded biculturalism learn more about satisfactory and non-satisfactory sources of support outside of work. This finding is in line with earlier research indicating that African-Americans tend to seek extraorganizational sources, particularly family and romantic partners. Those high in conflicted biculturalism report learning more about self-appraisal than do those who have low scores. Looking at the conflicted bicultural scale, those who have stronger feelings of conflict are more worried about how they are performing and are trying to assess their performance more than those who feel less conflict.

Contributions

This study makes contributions to both theory and practice. On the theoretical end, the social identity and ethnic identity literature are linked to the socialization literature. This study begins to scratch the surface in our understanding of the true impact that role identity plays during the organizational socialization process. However, the empirical findings in this study suggest that this is a topic worth researching further to determine the broader role of identity in this process.

A contribution is made to organizational socialization literature by better understanding the role that the individual difference variable of biculturalism plays in the socialization process. Taylor and Giannantonio (1993) have noted the lack of interest by researchers who have failed to examine the socialization experiences of

various racial/ethnic new hires. In addition, by studying ethnic identity rather than mere demographic differences, I responded to the request made by Bell and Nkomo (1994) to study the cultural significance of race rather than mere monolithic group differences.

Thus far, I have only discussed biculturalism in a positive light as a type of strategy. However, not everyone agrees that biculturalism is an effective tool (Parks, 1928, Stonequist, 1937). Parks (1928) discussed biculturalism in the context of marginality and the idea of not really fitting into either the dominant or minority culture. Stonequist, a student of Parks, traveled the world studying various cultures in Europe, Hawaii and the Caribbean to learn more about this problem of marginality. Stonequist includes in his discussion of marginality the concept of duality that DuBois wrote about 30 years before.

Stonequist writes:

Wherever there are cultural transition and cultural conflicts there are marginal personalities. If the cultural differences are of major importance, if they include sharp contrasts in race, and if the social attitudes are hostile, the problem of the individual whose sentiments and career are bound up with both societies may well be acute. His dual social connections will then be reflected in the type of life he leads, the nature of his achievements or failures, his conception of himself, and many of his social attitudes and aspirations. He will, in fact, be a kind of dual personality... (p.3).

Further:

“It is the fact of cultural duality which is the determining influence in the life of the marginal man. His is not a clash between inborn temperament and social expectation, between congenial personality tendency and the patterns of a given culture. His is not a problem of adjusting a single-looking-glass self, but two or more such selves. And his adjustment pattern seldom secures complete cultural guidance and support, for his problem arises out of the shifting social order itself (p.217).

The marginal person does not fit into either culture well, but feels like an outsider in both worlds or cultures. The way biculturalism has been measured here has not allowed for the individual to describe the marginality and not fitting in either culture, instead the focus has been on the duality as one negotiates two cultures.

Although I measured the racial composition of the participants' current work organization, I did not assess people's previous experience or prior exposure to the majority culture. Persons whose childhood, current neighborhood, and school were based mainly in the African-American community could have very different experiences and reactions to their current situation than those who dealt with mixed or majority communities in any of those areas before their current situation. A situation in which one feels marginal is created from the conflict that stems from the group attitudes about the cultural differences, not just the mixing of cultures (Stonequist, 1937).

Another key contribution of this work is a better understanding of the complexity of biculturalism. It is now becoming more recognized that race should be viewed as a psychological variable rather than a categorical variable (Chrobot-Mason & Thomas, 2000). Biculturalism was measured in this study as a stable variable, but perhaps it is more dynamic. By using a self-report questionnaire, I was able to get a snapshot of biculturalism but did not measure the richness and full complexity of the construct.

An example of the complexity associated with the construct of biculturalism can be found in Stonequist's marginal person. "From an external point of view, the individual appears to be socially adjusted: he has family and friends, perhaps a good position and a measure of success. But his mind is not quite in harmony with his social

world. He need not be unhappy; in fact, he may laugh at his position; but laughter may be compensatory and not satisfactorily disclose his real state of mind.” (1937; p.201). As is illustrated in the quote, there is a cognitive component to it that is extremely difficult to measure. Most of my measures focused on behaviors, which are external. So while I may have been able to measure the behaviors one is using to cope, perhaps a true piece of the biculturalism puzzle is to be found in the cognitive aspect of biculturalism which was given less attention. The conflict subscale does assess some of the internal conflict one experiences but it is only comprised of three questions and cannot be considered exhaustive.

Research Contributions

This study contributes to researchers by using a fairly new methodology, that is the use of the Internet to collect data. Although the Internet is commonly used today as a method of seeking information and shopping, its impact on research efforts are not yet fully understood. For example, for dissertation research, some doctoral students ingeniously created websites as their dissertations (Chamberlin, 2000). One student created a site for the general public that offers information and resources about clinical depression.

McKenna and Bargh (1998) used Internet newsgroups to study marginalized concealable identities (e.g. sexual, white supremacy, and illegal drug usage groups). In their three studies, they content coded posted messages and then posted a short questionnaire in the newsgroup asking members to complete it. The authors reported that individuals with concealable stigmatized identities joined the newsgroup because they had found a group based on that identity to which to belong. Further, individuals

in these groups who considered their membership important modified their behavior based on reactions of other group members through posting. Involvement with the group and subsequently importance to identity were measured by time spent posting, reading and responding to messages.

The Internet allowed McKenna and Bargh to reach and study individuals who are considerably hard to find because they belong to socially stigmatized groups. Reaching my sample size would have been extremely difficult using many organizations and mailing questionnaires. However, the use of the Internet potentially allowed me to reach people across the country. One important issue in using the Internet to collect data is to have multiple checks in the questionnaire to better ensure that one is reaching the targeted demographic sample.

Using the Internet is not appropriate for all research projects. Nearly two-thirds of Internet users have college degrees and half are professionals or managers (Stanton, 1998). Thus, use of the Internet would depend on the population of interest for the study and can allow for a demographically and geographically diverse sample. The Internet can also be extremely helpful in studies focusing on cultural/international differences by collecting data more easily and through a similar medium. In addition, as McKenna and Bargh learned, the Internet can be useful in studying groups with socially stigmatized identities and in their natural environment.

Applied Contributions

From an applied standpoint, the information obtained in this study will enable practitioners to establish more effective socialization practices for their various constituencies. By recognizing that certain people may have different socialization

needs, organizations can tailor socialization programs to meet the various uncertainty reduction needs of their new hires (Teboul, 1998). African-American professionals can benefit from this information as well. By making them aware of their ethnic identity development and uncertainty reduction strategies, new hires may be able to realize whether or not they are getting the information they need. If they are not, African-Americans can be taught to correct their strategies and obtain the information they need to become successfully socialized and, ultimately, be more successful members of the organization.

This research should also impact broader diversity efforts that organizations attempt to undertake. Friedman (1996; cited in Chrobot-Mason & Thomas, 2000) found that many African-American employees in companies with Black employee networks do not join because they do not want to be labeled as troublemakers. However, many employee networks are quite successful. Thus, it is important to determine if certain African-Americans, based on their comfort level with their biculturalism, are not joining these networks. Organizations can try to market the networks in a different way and tie in learning about the organization from people at all levels, rather than just a network that some “troublemakers” join.

Alternate Variables

Biculturalism only accounts for a small amount of the variation in any of the above tested hypotheses. Even with the measurement difficulties associated with biculturalism, it is highly unlikely that it is the only variable important in the organizational socialization process. Perhaps focusing only on ethnic identity was too

narrow a focus. Individuals bring many pieces of themselves to the organization. Other potential variables include self-efficacy and desire to develop an organizational identity.

Self-Efficacy. Bandura (1977) has defined self-efficacy as the beliefs about one's ability to attain specific goals (Kanfer, p. 133 HB1). The expectations develop from past experience, social influence, performance feedback and are task-specific. Kanfer and Hulin (1985) discussed in Kanfer (1990) found that those who had recently been terminated and had high self-efficacy expectations for regaining employment engaged in more job search activities and were more likely to acquire a job. Thus, based on goals an individual sets, self-efficacy could influence the choice of information-seeking strategy chosen. For example, an individual who has high self-efficacy on finding out information about how to perform a certain task may choose multiple strategies for seeking information until they obtain the desired information.

In addition, self-efficacy expectations can be determined, in part, on one's past experiences. Thus, depending on how successful people have been in obtaining information in other areas or other jobs could also play a part in determining which strategies and sources people seek for information. Perhaps having done a similar job in the past may make the new hire more comfortable in seeking others to help them learn the task. Because the new hire does not feel as uncomfortable, the person may be more likely to use an overt strategy rather than a covert strategy. Another example is of an individual who has learned that by observing others' behavior in certain contexts, allows the new hire to learn the acceptable group norms. Thus, in the new work context, the new hire will observe the behavior of others to learn the norms of the group.

Finally, bicultural efficacy may impact how successful one is at straddling two contexts. Bicultural efficacy is the “belief...that one can live effectively, and in a satisfying manner, within two groups without comprising one’s sense of cultural identity” (p. 404; LaFromboise, et al., 1994). The hypothesis, based on Bandura’s self-efficacy work, is that the more individuals believe they can achieve something, the more likely they are to achieve it. Thus, the more an individual believes he or she can achieve bicultural efficacy, the more likely he or she will. Adding support to this theory, Berry et al (1987) reported that those who seek integration feel minimal stress. In addition, other research has found that those who are effectively bicultural exhibit more “behavioral flexibility and multicultural skills” than those who are not (Garza & Romero, 1982, p.239).

Effectively bicultural individuals work to have social support in both cultures. This social support has been reported to help black women reduce some of the stress associated with a bicultural life (Denton, 1990). Other women reported completely separating or compartmentalizing their lives to deal with stress (Bell, 1990). Bicultural African Americans are more likely than Whites to experience stress and understand the racial reality of why they are excluded from informal networks. This stress could also manifest itself in efforts to join the employee networks previously discussed. Some African-American employees may seek to join a network for the social support and networking opportunities it can provide. However, bicultural individuals may feel caught as they negotiate the work setting in desiring to join the network. They could feel that others might perceive them as separatists. Bicultural individuals are highly aware of their behavior and how they perceive European Americans view them. Thus,

they will experience an increase in stress in trying to determine if they should join the network to gain social support or risk alienating other colleagues.

Organizational Identities. For some individuals developing an organizational identity may be more important than their current ethnic identity. As Chrobot-Mason and Thomas (2000) suggest, while “social identity...may help explain some of the difficulties organizational members face in adapting to a more multiculturally diverse workplace, it does not account for the variability that exists within racial/ethnic groups” (p.4). For some people who enter the organization, race may not be salient in an organizational context for them and social identity, as a variable, is lacking because it does not take this into account (Chrobot-Mason & Thomas, 2000). Fitting in the group or belonging to the organization may dictate from whom they choose to seek information and how, rather than their ethnic identity.

Limitations

Some of the limitations of this study included the measures used for racial and ethnic identity, data collection issues and social desirability in answering some of the questions. Perhaps the construct of ethnic or racial identity is related to the socialization process, but the way it has been measured in this study is not the most accurate or appropriate measure.

Ethnic identity was measured using Phinney's revised MEIM. In the past this measure has been used primarily with adolescents and high school students, although the original measure was validated on a college sample. There are two components in the current measure: affirmation/belonging and exploration. Phinney and her colleagues assert that the overall scale can be considered a measure of global

assessment of ethnic identity (Roberts, et al., 1999). In this study, the mean score of the total scale and subscale scores were much higher than the scores of the adolescents in the most recent factor analysis. Roberts and his colleagues suggest that perhaps there is a gradual increase in ethnic identity as one grows or develops (Roberts, et al., 1999). Most of my sample ranges age between 25 and 34. While Roberts' assertion may explain the high means, it was nonetheless difficult to differentiate individuals based on their MEIM scores.

Perhaps a better way to measure ethnic or racial identity particularly in the workplace is to use the more context specific measures of Cross or Sellers (MMRI). As mentioned previously, neither had measures available at the time of this research.

The MMRI model allows for both stable person characteristics as well as situational influences of racial identity to predict behavior. The authors recognize that although some people live every aspect of their lives based on one ideology, usually people have numerous, combined philosophies. For example, some people may hold assimilationist beliefs that African Americans should integrate White institutions yet simultaneously maintain nationalist sentiments that African Americans should only expose their children to African-American culture.

Sellers et al. (1998) further assert that the various dimensions of racial identity are related to different behavioral outcomes and in turn, researchers should determine the research goals and choose the appropriate dimensions. Unfortunately, there are potential problems in using the ideology subscale in certain contexts. For example, it will be extremely difficult to determine if an individual simply has adopted an ideology

and lives according to that ideology in the workplace or if the individual has adapted certain behaviors to survive in the workplace.

The African-American Acculturation Scale II (AAAS II; Landrine & Klonoff, 1995) is an established scale based on knowledge and practices of the African American culture. The scale was problematic in this study in that the items do not accurately reflect an acculturated orientation at work. The items are based on knowledge and behaviors not germane to a work context such as: the type of music one listens to, food one eats, superstitious beliefs, religious beliefs, the racial makeup of the neighborhood where one grew up and the racial composition of the high school one attended. Because the focus of the research was socialization behaviors that occur at work, the AAAS holds little face validity in this study.

In addition, some participants responded that the items in this scale were stereotypical and thus were offensive. All participants fell in the middle range of this scale indicating that they had moderate acculturated orientations. The stereotypic nature of some of the items on the scale may have lead to increased social desirability when answering the items. It is not surprising that this scale is not related to many types of information seeking as measured in this study.

As with many studies, a possible limitation is the way the data were collected. The results of the study are subject to mono-method bias (Cook & Campbell, 1979). Cook and Campbell suggest varying the attitude statements to be worded positively or negatively, varying whether the positive or negative end of the scale appears on the same side of the page. This study was ambitious in attempting to link three areas of the literature that had not been previously linked. Because of this, where possible, it was

important to use the established measures in the way the author(s) suggested. This includes not rewording items to be negative or positive or changing the presentation of the scale from left to right. One exception was made to the Landrine and Klonoff (1995) scale to reduce the 7-point Likert-type scale to a Likert-scale. However, to check for mono-method bias, a factor analysis was conducted on the variables in the study. The eleven variables loaded on 5 different factors, suggesting that the constructs are somewhat independent.

I also attempted to determine if the order of the identity scales primed participants. Paper and pencil questionnaires had the Landrine and Klondoff scale first, and the Phinney's MEIM scale second. On the website, it was reversed. Due to the nature of the website and the length of the questionnaire, it was very difficult, without recreating the whole site, to have the scales ordered differently. The number of questionnaires received back from the paper and pencil method are significantly fewer than those received from the internet, so that ordering effects of the identity scales cannot be determined.

Self report measures are always problematic because there can be inaccuracies due to poor recall. This questionnaire asked participants to recall a time over the previous 24 months when they had experienced uncertainty. Based on the behavioral event interview literature, asking people to recall a situation and describe it in detail leads to more accurate recall than asking them to recall a situation without explaining it. By asking participants to write down the situations, it is anticipated that some of the self-report inaccuracies have been reduced.

The sample is biased in terms of voluntary participation and those who had the patience to spend the 30 to 90 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Participation in the study was voluntary. Thus, the participants were not randomly selected from the population, but self-selected to participate in the study.

Future Research

This study is an initial step in what I hope becomes a more popular area of research. As discussed above, adequate measures of biculturalism are needed. We must develop better and more creative ways to measure this complex construct. It is clear that my measure of biculturalism focuses on the conflicted aspects of biculturalism. The conflicted feelings as one navigates multiple contexts are just one aspect of biculturalism. A more comprehensive global measure of biculturalism needs to be developed. For example, attention should be given to communication efforts, such as code switching, which is the ability to communicate verbally and nonverbally with both the new language and the primary language (LaFromboise et al., 1994). Although I did attempt to address a minor aspect of code switching by asking about “behaving differently around black people when white people are also present, “ it was unsuccessful. I focused on behavior rather than verbal and nonverbal tactics.

Another suggestion to better understand the dynamic construct of biculturalism is a longitudinal study. In this way, changes in biculturalism can be assessed over time. Studying the same group of people over the socialization period of about two years will allow for the measurement of any changes in biculturalism as they proceed through the process of becoming adjusted to the organization. It would also allow direct

measurement of organizational status of these individuals, such as promotion or leaving the organization.

More creative methods of measuring biculturalism also need to be employed. One of the shortcomings of this study was that only a Likert measure of biculturalism was used providing a snapshot of biculturalism. Future efforts could use focus groups to refine the measure. In addition, participants could participate in multiple interviews or be asked to keep diaries throughout the socialization process that address specific and general aspects of biculturalism and information-seeking. In addition, a measure of self-efficacy and bicultural efficacy should be included in future studies to assess the impact that it has on information-seeking efforts.

An area to which I gave insufficient attention is the interaction and perceptions of those in the environment to which one is being socialized. How does the culture affect one's biculturalism level as measured by outward behaviors? Although the willingness of supervisors and coworkers to welcome the newcomer to the organization was assessed, the simple questions asked only scratched the surface of these complex relationships.

A second yet very related area to study is that of the impact of physical appearance on one's biculturalism. The idea of marginality has been discussed above. Many have argued (e.g., Stonequist) that only those who have similar physical traits to the mainstream can even think about trying to "pass" as a member of the dominant society. Questions still remain about how people's physical appearance allows them to succeed or not in an organization. Do people who have similar characteristics to the mainstream (e.g., lighter skin, more Eurocentric features) face an easier time at work?

Are others less threatened by them? Are they welcomed and thus socialized more easily into the organization? These and many related questions need to be addressed. It is such a difficult topic to study because many people are not comfortable studying physical appearance as it relates to racial group membership. Those who do may be labeled racists in this politically correct era of acceptance and diversity.

Not only should the perceptions and outwardly successful signs of socialization be studied in the context of physical appearance and in relation to biculturalism, but the internal processes should also be studied. For example, what type of internal conflicts do those who are lighter or less physically threatening experience with respect to their racial identity or biculturalism development? The findings of this dissertation suggest that biculturalism as related to the organizational socialization process is a viable topic for future and expanded research.

Appendix A

Socialization Models

| Feldman's (1976) Three Stage Entry Model | Buchanan's (1974) Three-Stage Early Career Model | Porter-Lawler-Hackman's (1975) Three-Stage Entry Model | Schein's (1978) Three-Stage Socialization Model | Wanous (1980) Integrative Approach to Stages of Socialization |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Stage 1: Anticipatory socialization - "getting in" Setting of realistic expectations Determining match with the newcomer</p> | | <p>Stage 1: Prearrival Setting of newcomer expectations Reward and punishment behaviors</p> | | |
| <p>Stage 2: Accommodation- "breaking in" Initiation to the job Establish interpersonal relationships Role clarified Congruence b/t self & organizational performance appraisal</p> | <p>Stage 1: First year: basic training & initiation Establish role clarify for newcomer establish cohesion with peers Clarify relationship of peers with rest of organization Confirmation/ disconfirmation of expectations loyalty, conflicts with organizational outside interests</p> | <p>Stage 2: Encounter Confirmation/ disconfirmation of expectations Reward & punishment of behaviors</p> | <p>Stage 1: Entry Search for accurate information Creation of false expectations by both parties Inaccurate information is basis for job choice</p> | <p>Stage 1: Confronting and accepting org reality Confirmation/ disconfirmation of expectations Conflicts between personal values and organizational climates Discovering rewarded/ punished behaviors</p> |

| Feldman's (1976) Three Stage Entry Model | Buchanan's (1974) Three-Stage Early Career Model | Porter-Lawler-Hackman's (1975) Three-Stage Entry Model | Schein's (1978) Three-Stage Socialization Model | Wanous (1980) Integrative Approach to Stages of Soc. |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Stage 3: Role management "settling in" The degree of fit b/t one's life interests outside of work and demands of the org. Resolution of conflicts at the work place itself</p> | <p>Stage 2: Performance- years 2-4 at work Commitment to the org according to norms reinforcement of self-image by organization Resolution of conflicts Feelings of personal importance</p> | <p>Stage 3: Change and acquisition Alteration of newcomer's self-image Form new relationships Adopt new values Acquire new behaviors</p> | <p>Stage 2: Socialization Accept org reality Cope w/resistance to change Congruence b/t org climate and person's needs Org's evaluation of newcomer's performance Cope w/either too much ambiguity or too much structure</p> | <p>Stage 2: Achieving role clarity Initiation to the job's tasks Define interpersonal roles Coping w/resistance to change Congruence b/t self & org performance appraisals Coping with structure and ambiguity</p> |
| | | | | <p>Stage 3: Locating oneself in the org context Learning behaviors congruent w/org's desires Outside and work interest conflicts resolved Job challenge leads to work commitments Wanous (1980) Integrative Approach</p> |

| Feldman's (1976) Three Stage Entry Model | Buchanan's (1974) Three-Stage Early Career Model | Porter-Lawler-Hackman's (1975) Three-Stage Entry Model | Schein's (1978) Three-Stage Socialization Model | Wanous (1980) Integrative Approach to Stages of Soc. |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | New interpersonal relations, new values, and altered self-image |
| | | | Stage 3: Mutual acceptance Signals of org acceptance Signal of newcomer's acceptance Commitment to the org Commitment to work | Stage 4: Detecting signposts of successful socialization Company dependability and commitment High general satisfaction Feelings of mutual acceptance job involvement and intrinsic motivation increases |
| | Stage 3: Organizational dependability-the fifth year and beyond All succeeding years are in this stage] Diversity due to individual experiences | | | |

Taken from Wanous, J.P. (1992). Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, orientation and socialization of newcomers (2nd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, p.218.

Appendix B

Sample Organizational Letter

Date

Dear Organization:

I am currently working on my dissertation research, in which I am exploring how African Americans seek information and become accepted members of the work organization that they join. This is an extremely important topic in which little, if any, research exists.

It is known that the information and relationships a person develops during the first few years in an organization are crucial to successful career development and advancement within an organization. In addition, in this time of high turnover and temporary job assignments, it is essential that new hires are socialized into the organization as quickly as possible. If African American new hires are not seeking information or receiving the information they seek due to internal reasons, then they can be taught better ways of seeking information. It is critical that all the workforce be used to their full potential as quickly as possible.

In order to complete my study, I ask for your help. I am seeking African American professional new hires (those who have been in the organization two years or less) to fill out my questionnaire. This job may be the first for them or they may have had other jobs in this field or others. It should take only about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

All responses will be kept strictly confidential. There will be no cost to participate. You will receive a final report of the results on the socialization processes of African Americans across the country. If enough people participate from your company, then you may also receive data that will help you tailor your new hire socialization programs.

I have enclosed the questionnaire for your review. If you are interested in participating in the study or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (212) 701-4334. Thank you for your time. I look forward to speaking with you further.

Sincerely,

Pamela Lipp

Appendix C

African American Acculturation Scale ¹³

Please tell us how much you personally agree or disagree with the beliefs and attitudes listed below by circling a number. There is no right or wrong answer. We want your honest opinion.

| | I Totally Disagree Not True at All 1 | 2 | I Sort of Agree Sort of True 3 | 4 | I Strongly Agree Absolutely True 5 |
|-----|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. | Most of the music I listen to is by Blacks artists. | | | | |
| 2. | I like Black music more than White music. | | | | |
| 3. | The person I admire most is Black. | | | | |
| 4. | I listen to Black radio stations. | | | | |
| 5. | I try to watch all the Black shows on TV. | | | | |
| 6. | Most of my friends are Black. | | | | |
| 7. | I believe in the Holy Ghost. | | | | |
| 8. | I believe in heaven and hell. | | | | |
| 9. | I like gospel music. | | | | |
| 10. | I am currently a member of a Black church. | | | | |
| 11. | Prayer can cure disease. | | | | |
| 12. | The church is the heart of the Black community. | | | | |
| 13. | I eat traditional black foods. | | | | |
| 14. | I often take time to sit and eat lunch with my coworkers | | | | |
| 15. | I try to balance my life among work, social and spiritual activities. | | | | |
| 16. | I like to cook. | | | | |
| 17. | I went to a mostly Black elementary school. | | | | |
| 18. | I grew up in a mostly Black neighborhood. | | | | |
| 19. | I went to a mostly Black high school. | | | | |
| 20. | I avoid splitting a pole. | | | | |
| 21. | When the palm of your hand itches, you'll receive some money. | | | | |

¹³ Items 13-16 were not part of the original scale nor were they used as part of the analysis. Those items were generated and included as "place holders" in the website after the traditional food subscale was deleted because there were concerns the site would crash if the scale had to be reconstructed.

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. | There's some truth to many old superstitions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | IQ tests were set up purposefully to discriminate against Black people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | Most tests (like the SATs and tests to get a job) are set up to make sure that Blacks don't get high scores on them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | Deep in their hearts, most White people are racists. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. | I have seen people "fall out." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. | I know what "falling out" means. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. | When I was a child, I used to play tonk. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. | I know how to play bid whist. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. | It's better to try to move your whole family ahead in this world than it is to be our for only yourself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. | Old people are wise. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| 32. | When I was young, my parent(s) sent me to stay with a relative (aunt, uncle, grandmother) for a few days or weeks and then I went back home again. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. | When I was young, I took a bath with my sister, brother or some relative. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Bicultural Items

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. | I spend a great deal of my time at work challenging stereotypical images of African Americans. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. | I think others perceive me as a token hire. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. | Few of my significant personal relationships are rooted in the Black community. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37. | I lead two completely different lives: one professional, one personal. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38. | I feel pulled between my achievements at work and my roots. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 39. | I constantly struggle to remain black in a white world. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40. | I am very conscious of my behavior around white people at work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 41. | While at work, I behave differently around black people when white people are also present. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 42. | I often feel demotivated or frustrated at work because I cannot express myself freely. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 43. | As I become immersed in white culture, my circle of relationships with other blacks becomes smaller. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 44. | I have to stay one step ahead just to prove I am qualified. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 45. | I can identify more with white people than they can with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 46. | I have an advantage over my white peers by having extensive knowledge of both black and white cultures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Appendix D

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

In this country, people come from different countries and cultures, there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or *ethnic groups* that people come from. Some of the examples include Hispanic or Latino, Native American or American Indian and Asian American. 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 _____

Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Somewhat Agree 3 | Strongly Agree 4 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its' history, traditions, and customs. _____
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group. _____
3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me. _____
4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership. _____
5. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to. _____
6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. _____
7. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me. _____
8. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. _____
9. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group. _____

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Somewhat Agree 3 | Strongly Agree 4 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|

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

11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group. _____

12. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. _____

Write in the number that gives the best answer to the question.

13. My ethnicity is: _____

- (1) Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander
 - (2) Black or African-American
 - (3) Hispanic or Latino
 - (4) White, Caucasian, European, not Hispanic
 - (5) American Indian
 - (6) Bi-ethnic/Multiethnic (parents are from at least two different groups)
 - (7) Other (write in)
-

Appendix E

New Hire Uncertainty Measure

When individuals enter organizations, they typically encounter situations or events in which they experience a great deal of uncertainty or ambiguity. Often uncertainty involves one of three situations. The first is about how to accomplish tasks. A second type involves being or appearing to be successful or competent on the job. The third type of uncertainty frequently experienced revolves around one's personal relationships with others at work. This uncertainty or ambiguity may take the form of self-addressed questions like "what should I do now," "what does this mean?" "now what?," "what am I going to do?" Can you recall a situation where you didn't know what to do? Describe the circumstances around the event? What happened first? What happened next? How did it end?

What exactly made you uncertain in this situation?

Appendix F

The following questions are related to the situation you described in section 2 on the previous page.

I am interested in how you went about seeking information to reduce the uncertainty you described in the situation above. I am also interested in knowing who you obtained information from in this situation and how similar they are to you. For each item, please **circle all** those from whom you obtained information. (For now, please ignore the boxes labeled "S" and "E.B.")

To reduce my uncertainty in the situation I described above,

1 I asked specific, straight to the point questions to get the information I wanted. I did this with (circle those that apply):

- a supervisor
- a coworker
- a subordinate
- a romantic partner/spouse
- a family member
- a friend
- Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

3 I asked a third party not associated with the incident for information. I used the following as a third party (circle those that apply):

- a supervisor
- a coworker
- a subordinate
- a romantic partner/spouse
- a family member
- a friend
- Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

2 I indicated my curiosity about the topic without directly asking for the information. I did this with (circle those that apply):

- a supervisor
- a coworker
- a subordinate
- a romantic partner/spouse
- a family member
- a friend
- Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

4 I intentionally "messed up" on something related to the incident to see how another/others would react. I "messed up" with (circle those that apply):

- a supervisor
- a coworker
- a subordinate
- a romantic partner/spouse
- a family member
- a friend
- Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

To reduce my uncertainty in the situation I described above,

5 I hinted non-verbally that I would like to know this information. I hinted nonverbally to (circle those that apply):
 a supervisor
 a coworker
 a subordinate
 a romantic partner/spouse
 a family member
 a friend
 Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

6 I looked for the “answers” in the behavior of another/others. I looked at the behavior of (circle those that apply):
 a supervisor
 a coworker
 a subordinate
 a romantic partner/spouse
 a family member
 a friend
 Other (specify) _____

| S | E.B |
|---|-----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

7 I went about my tasks, but paid particular attention to any relevant information coming my way from (circle those that apply):
 a supervisor
 a coworker
 a subordinate
 a romantic partner/spouse
 a family member
 a friend
 Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

8 I did not “beat around the bush” in asking for information from (circle those that apply):
 a supervisor
 a coworker
 a subordinate
 a romantic partner/spouse
 a family member
 a friend
 Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

To reduce my uncertainty in the situation I described above,

- 13 I paid attention to how another/others acted toward me and tried to relate these actions to the topic. I paid close attention to (circle those that apply):
- a supervisor
 - a coworker
 - a subordinate
 - a romantic partner/spouse
 - a family member
 - a friend
 - Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

- 14 I found out the information by keeping my eyes and ears open to what others around me were doing. I kept my eyes and ears on (circle those that apply):
- a supervisor
 - a coworker
 - a subordinate
 - a romantic partner/spouse
 - a family member
 - a friend
 - Other (specify) _____

| S | EB |
|---|----|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

STOP!!!! Now, go back to the top of this section. Place a check mark in the box "S" if the person is the **SAME SEX** as you. Place a check in the "EB" box if the person is the **SAME ETHNIC BACKGROUND** as you.

Appendix G

Perceived Social Costs

I am now interested in how it felt for you to seek the information you wrote about in section 2.

Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Disagree nor Agree 3 | Somewhat Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|

1. I was not embarrassed to seek this information. _____
2. A newcomer, like myself, would be thought of negatively for seeking this information. _____
3. If I were to seek this information, I would make myself and the person I approached uncomfortable. _____
4. I had little to lose in seeking this information. _____
5. By seeking this information I would be violating social norms. _____

6. I was received positively by my supervisor. _____
7. My peers treated me like an outsider. _____
8. My supervisor left me to my own devices. _____
9. Many of my coworkers told me to ask them for help whenever I needed it. _____
10. My work is extremely important to me. _____
11. My hobbies/outside interests are extremely important to me. _____

Appendix H

Please tell me how much you personally agree or disagree with the beliefs and attitudes listed below by circling a number. There is no right or wrong answer. I want your honest opinion.

| Very Strongly Disagree | | | | Neither Disagree nor Agree | | | | Very Strongly Agree |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | There is a special person who is around when I am in need. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. | There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | My family really tries to help me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | I get the emotional help and support I need from my family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | My friends really try to help me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | I can count on my friends when things go wrong. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | I can talk about my problems to my family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. | I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | My family is willing to help me make decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. | I can talk about my problems with my friends. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|--|
| not applicable 0 | not at all important 1 | Somewhat important 2 | important 3 | extremely important 4 |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|--|

How important are each of the following to you in providing support?

____ mentor ____ friends (outside work) ____ family member
____ coworkers ____ subordinate ____ romantic partners

Appendix I

For the following items *first*, indicate how much support you receive in your job *now*. *Secondly*, indicate how often you *need* that support in order to perform at your best and advance in your career.

| Never or almost never | Occasionally | About half the time | More time than not | Almost all the time or all the time |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|-----|
| My immediate supervisor created opportunities for me (visibility, key assignments, training, etc.) | | | | |
| 1. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 2. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| I can make mistakes and learn from them without threatening my job or my future in the organization. | | | | |
| 3. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 4. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| I feel welcome and comfortable at work. | | | | |
| 5. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 6. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| My immediate supervisor shares timely information that helps me in my work. | | | | |
| 7. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 8. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| My coworkers share information I need to do my job well. | | | | |
| 9. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 10. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My immediate supervisor encourages me to try new ways of doing things even when there are some risks involved. | | | | | |
| 11. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I receive useful information about corporate policies and practices that can support me. | | | | | |
| 13. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I receive useful feedback about my skills and abilities. | | | | | |
| 15. How much <u>now</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. How much do you <u>need</u> ? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Appendix J

Learning

Now I am interested in finding out whether you feel you learned something from the situation you described in section 2 and the information-seeking activities you engaged in. Please check off all the things that you learned from the situation described above. If you do not recall learning anything from this experience, please turn the page.

I learned....

Task

1. _____ how to perform a specific task(s) related to my job.
2. _____ some formal procedure(s) for my job.
3. _____ how much responsibility accompanied my job.

Facing uncertainty, problems, mistakes (Norms 1)

4. _____ it was acceptable not to know the answer to something.
5. _____ it was expected that I take risks.
6. _____ others have gone through the same thing as me.

Asking Questions or for Assistance (Norms 2)

7. _____ if I don't know something, I should ask.
8. _____ when to ask questions and when not to ask questions.

Idiosyncratic Norms

9. _____ the way things are done in the group.
- 10 _____ general rules about the way decisions are made.

11. _____ how I am performing with regard to my job.
12. _____ I am performing better than I thought.
13. _____ I am not performing as well as I thought I was.
14. _____ I need to improve my performance in certain areas.

Other appraisal

15. _____ how others view my performance.

Sources of nonsupport and dissatisfaction with work

16. _____ who/what I could rely upon for advice and information at work.
17. _____ who/what I could rely upon for help and support at work.
18. _____ who/what I could rely upon for advice and information outside work.
19. _____ who/what I could rely upon for help and support outside work.

Sources of nonsupport and dissatisfaction with work

20. _____ who/what I could not rely on for advice and information at work.
21. _____ who/what I could not rely on for help and support at work.
22. _____ who/what I could not rely on for advice and information outside work.
23. _____ who/what I could not rely on for help and support outside work.

Nature of relationships at work

24. _____ how people interact with each other.
25. _____ about the workplace atmosphere.

Appendix K
Demographic Questions

Please respond:

1. Sex: _____ Male
 _____ Female
2. Age: _____
3. Highest level of education achieved:
- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| _____ GED/H.S. equivalency | _____ Bachelor Degree |
| _____ H.S. Diploma | _____ Graduate Work |
| _____ Some College | _____ Masters Degree |
| _____ Associate Degree | _____ Ph.D. |

4. How many people does your organization employ?

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| _____ less than 50 | _____ 1,000-10,000 |
| _____ 50-100 | _____ 10,000 - 50,000 |
| _____ 100-500 | _____ 60,000 - 100,000 |
| _____ 500-1,000 | _____ over 100,000 |

5. What is the percentage of African Americans in your organization? _____

6. In what industry is your organization?

7. What is your profession?

8. Does your organization have an official program to welcome new hires to the organization and help them get adjusted?

___ yes ___ no

8a. Does your organization have a formal mentoring program for all members?

___ yes ___ no

9. I have held my current job for ___ months.

10. I have been in the organization ___ months.

11. Do you have a romantic partner? ___

12. Do you have a subordinate(s)? _____

13. Do you belong to African American professional organizations? _____

13a. If so, how many? ___

14. Do you belong to African American social organizations? _____

14a. If so, how many? _____

15. Have you had other jobs in your current field? _____

15a. If so, how many? _____

16. Have you had other professional jobs? _____

16a. If so, how many? _____

Appendix L
Letter of Introduction

Dear Participant:

Thank you very much for taking the time to consider participating in my study. I am a graduate student currently working on my dissertation in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the City University of New York, Baruch College. My interest is in how people feel about their ethnic identity and how this may affect them at work. At one time, each one of us was new to the organization where we currently work. When you first start a job, there are many things that you do not know or understand. I am interested in how you sought information when you were new to the organization.

To participate in this study, I am asking you to fill out a questionnaire that should take only 30 minutes to complete. There are 3 parts to the enclosed packet. Let me explain what they are and what you need to do. Please read this carefully before completing the questionnaire.

1. The first form is on a single page and titled Consent Form. I am required to ask each participant to sign this form and return it to me. To maintain your confidentiality, I would like you to keep this form separate from the rest of the questionnaire. Stapled to this page is an envelope (4" x 9.5"). If you decide to participate in the study, please sign the form and place it in the attached envelope.

2. The questionnaire consists of several pages of questions. Start at the beginning and follow the directions in the booklet. You can do this fairly quickly – I'd like your first reactions to the questions. Remember there are no right or wrong answers.

After you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the large 8-1/2" x 11" postage-paid envelope.

3. If you wish to receive the results of this study, please clearly print your name and address on the enclosed post card. The results will not be available for several months, but as soon as they are available, I will send them to you. Place the post card in the same envelope as the consent form, so that I can be sure it remains separate from your questionnaire.

4. When you have completed each of the above steps, seal the smaller envelope, place it in the large envelope and mail it back to me.

If you have any questions about these procedures, please feel free to call me at 212-701-4334. Thank you for your time and help.

Sincerely,

Pamela Lipp,
Doctoral Candidate

Appendix M
Consent Form

The impact of ethnic identity on uncertainty reduction during organizational socialization

In this study, you will be asked questions about how you seek information at work as well as your perceptions of your ethnic identity. To participate, you will fill out a questionnaire, requiring approximately 30 minutes of your time.

Your participation is completely voluntary. There are no risks involved in taking part in this study. The findings from this study may encourage organizations to focus on the individual needs of their employees. If at any time you change your mind about participating in the study, you are free to stop. There will be *no negative consequences* if you do not complete the questionnaire. Also, if some particular questions make you uncomfortable, please just skip them.

All the information you provide will remain completely anonymous and confidential. After you sign this sheet, place it in the envelope provided. Keep the second copy of the consent form for your records. Do not put any identifying information anywhere on the questionnaire, including your name. **ONLY** the researcher conducting this study will see your responses. Your individual answers will not be shared with anyone. Any presentation of data from this study will be presented only after it has been combined with many individual responses.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me, Pam Lipp, or Walter Reichman at the Psychology Department at Baruch College (212) 387-1530. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you can call the Grants Office (212)802-2911. To receive the results of this study, please clearly print your name and address on the enclosed post card and return to researcher with the consent form in the attached envelope.

I understand the above information presented to me and freely choose to participate in this research.

Participant's signature

Date

Participant's name (please print)

Date

Witness' signature

Date

Appendix N

Correlations of Information Learned with Information-Seeking Strategy

| | Covert info | Intraorg Covert Info | Overt | Intraorg Overt |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------|----------------|
| Learn task | .175* | .228* | .126 | .306** |
| Learn norms I | .220* | .275** | .273** | .360** |
| Learn other app | .205* | .155 | .266** | .178* |
| Normsi | .245** | .333** | .222* | .251** |
| Nature Relationships | .198* | .293** | .114 | .168 |
| Sat at work | .066 | .129 | .127 | .281** |
| Non-sat at work | .191* | .233** | .269** | .217* |
| Sat outside work | .235** | .234** | .165 | .108 |
| Non-sat outside work | .305** | .295** | .217* | .139 |
| Total | .297** | .369** | .285** | .351** |

Appendix N

Correlations of Information Learned with Intraorganizational Covert Information-Seeking Strategies

| Learning | Indirect | Third Party | Testing | Disguise | Observation | Surveillance |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Learn task | .170 | .116 | .043 | .116 | .133 | .236** |
| Learn norms1 | .153 | .147 | .153 | .281** | .130 | .221* |
| Learn norms2 | .026 | -.044 | -.091 | .056 | .093 | .158 |
| Learn self app | .170 | .045 | .138 | .169 | .036 | .195* |
| Learn other app | .226** | .184* | .127 | .212* | .138 | .161 |
| Normsi | .173* | .154 | .035 | .199* | .277** | .286** |
| Nature Relationships | .109 | .051 | .133 | .174* | .195* | .304** |
| Sat at work | .055 | .059 | .006 | -.049 | .065 | .165 |
| Non-sat at work | .104 | .237** | .085 | .065 | .123 | .204* |
| Sat outside work | .177* | .184* | .122 | .115 | .239** | .278** |
| Non-sat outside work | .277** | .200 | .205* | .179* | .217* | .198* |
| Total | .236** | .189* | .150 | .199* | .236** | .361** |

Appendix N

Correlations of Information Learned and Intraorganizational Source Sought

| | Intraorg Sources | Supervisor | Coworker | Direct Report |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Learn task | .265** | .297** | .262** | .079 |
| Learn norms1 | .317** | .319** | .298** | .140 |
| Learn self app | .153 | .194* | .160 | .038 |
| Learn other app | .175* | .199* | .195* | .024 |
| Normsi | .341** | .360** | .326** | .129 |
| Nature Relationships | .288** | .310** | .276** | .102 |
| Sat at work | .174* | .143 | .187* | .080 |
| Non-sat at work | .246** | .217* | .215* | .127 |
| Sat outside work | .225* | .264** | .196* | .099 |
| Non-sat outside work | .280** | .275** | .207 | .180* |
| Total | .393** | .396** | .375** | .164 |

Appendix N

Correlations of Information Learned and Extraorganizational Covert Information-Seeking Strategy

| | Extraorg Third Party | Extraorg Disguising Conv | Extraorg Observation | Extraorg Surveillance |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Learn other app | .235** | .211* | .142 | .049 |
| Non-sat at work | .091 | -.020 | .019 | .196* |
| Sat outside work | .176* | .110 | .139 | .157 |
| Non-sat outside work | .187* | .026 | .220 | .253** |

Correlations of Information Learned and Extraorganizational Source Sought

| | Extraorg sources | Romantic Partner | Family | Friends |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Learn other app | .240** | .186* | .153 | .223* |
| Sat outside work | .173* | .114 | .038 | .244** |
| Non-sat outside work | .196* | .182* | .101 | .179* |

References

- Aitcheson, C. (1997, April). Corporate America's black eye. Black Enterprise, 109.
- Alderfer, C.P. & Thomas, D.A. (1988). The significance of race and ethnicity for understanding organizational behavior. In C.L. Cooper and I. Robertson (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Anderson, T. & Harris, W.M. (1990). A socio-historical and contemporary study of African Americans in U.S. corporations. The Western Journal of Black Studies, 14(3), 174-181.
- Andujo, E. (1988). Ethnic identity of transethnically adopted Hispanic adolescents. Social Work, 33, 531-535.
- Aries, E. & Moorehead, K. (1989). The importance of ethnicity in the development of identity of black adolescents. Psychological Reports, 65, 75-82.
- Ashford, S.J. & Cummings, L.L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32, 370-398.
- Ashforth, B. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. Academy of Management Journal, 14(1), 20-39.
- Baron, R.M. & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173-1182.

Baskerville, D.M. & Tucker, S.H. (1991). A blueprint for success. Black Enterprise, November, 85-93.

Beatty, R.W. (1973). Blacks as supervisors: A study of training, job performance, and employers' expectations. Academy of Management Journal, 16(2), 196-206.

Bell, E.L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, 459-477.

Bell, E.L.J. & Nkomo, S.M. (1994). Barriers to workplace advancement experienced by African-Americans. U.S. Department of Labor: Glass Ceiling Commission.

Berger, C. & Calabrese, R. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a development theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1, 99-112.

Berlew, A.K. & Johnson, J.L. (1992). Role conflict and career advancement among African American women in nontraditional professions. The Career Development Quarterly, 40, 302-312.

Berry, J., Poortinga, Y.P., Segall, M., & Dasen, P. (1992). Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Branch, S. (1993). America's most powerful Black executives. Black Enterprise, February, 78-134.

Breakwell, G.M. (1988). Strategies adopted when identity is threatened. Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 1, 191-203.

Brewer, M. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17(5), 475-482.

Buchanan, II, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 533-546.

Burke, P. (1980). The self: Measurement requirements from an interactionist perspective. Social Psychology Quarterly, 43, 18-29.

Chao, G.T., Kozlowski, S.W.J., Major, D.A., & Gardner, P. (1994). The effects of organizational tactics and contextual factors on newcomer socialization and learning outcomes. Presentation at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.

Chamberlin, J. (2000, July/August). E-dissertations. Monitor on Psychology.

Chrobot-Mason, D & Thomas, K. (2000). The intersection of individual and organizational multicultural identity development. Paper presented at the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychologists Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Clark, K. (1997, June 9). These are the good old days. Fortune, 74.

Clarke, R.D. (2000, February). Has the glass ceiling really been shattered? Black Enterprise, p. 145.

Comer, D. (1991). Organizational newcomers' acquisition of information from peers. Management Communication Quarterly, 5(1), 64-89.

Cox, M. (1999, December 22). On-the-job racial harassment cases almost doubles in '90s. Courier-Post, 17A.

Cox, T., Jr. & Nkomo, S.M. (1986). Differential performance appraisal criteria: A field study of Black and White managers. Group & Organization Studies, 11(1-2), 101-119.

Crocker, J. & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem. Psychological Review, 96(4), 608-630.

Crocker, J. & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 60-67.

Crocker, L. & Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to classical and modern test theory. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Cross, Jr., W. E. (1971). The Negro-to-black conversion experience. Black World, 20(9), 13-27.

Cross, Jr., W. E. (1987). A two factor theory of Black identity: Implications for the study of identity development in minority children. In J.S. Phinney and M.J. Rotheram (Eds.), Children's ethnic socialization, (pp.117-133). Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Cross, Jr., W. E. (1991). Shades of black Diversity in African-American identity. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cross, Jr., W. E. (1994). Nigrescence theory: Historical and explanatory notes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44, 119-123.

Dana, R. (1993). Assessment of acculturation in Hispanic populations. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18(3), 317-328.

Darden, C. with Vers Walter (1996). In Contempt. New York: HarperCollins.

Deaux, K. (1989). Identity and change. Invited address at meeting of American Psychological Society, Alexandria, Virginia.

Deaux, K. (1992). Personalizing identity and socializing self. In G. Breakwell (Ed.), Social psychology of identity and the self-concept (pp. 9-33). London: Academic Press.

Deaux, K. (1996). Social identification. In E. Tory Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles (pp. 777-798). New York: Guilford Publications, Inc.

Demo, D.H. & Hughes, M. (1990). Socialization and racial identity among Black Americans. Social Psychology Quarterly, 53(4), 364-374.

Denton, T.C. (1990). Bonding and supportive relationships among black professional women: Rituals of restoration. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, 447-457.

Dickens, F. & Dickens, J. (1982). The black manager: Making it in the corporate world. New York: Amacom.

Digest of Education Statistics. (1993). National Center for Education Statistics.

DiTomaso, N., Thompson, D. & Blake, D.H. (1988). Corporate perspectives on the advancement of minority managers. In D. Thompson & N. DiTomaso (Eds.), Ensuring Minority Success in Corporate Management. New York: Plenum Press.

Doby, H. (2000, May). O'Neal gets key spot at Merrill Lynch. Black Enterprise, 21.

Dreher, G. & Cox, Jr., T. (1996). Race, gender, and opportunity: A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(3), 297-308.

DuBois, W.E.B. (1993). The souls of black folk. New York: Everyman's Library.

Dunnette, M., Avery, R., & Banas, P. (1973). Why do they leave? Personnel, 50, 25-39.

Ethier, K.A. & Deaux, K. (1990). Hispanics in ivy: Assessing identity and perceived threat. Sex Roles, 22, 427-440.

Ethier, K.A. & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(2), 243-251.

Evans, K.M. & Herr, E.L. (1994). The influence of racial identity and the perception of discrimination on the career aspirations of African American men and women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44, 173-185.

Feldman, D.C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 433-452.

Fernandez, J.P. (1975). Black managers in White corporations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Fisher, C. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In K. Roland and G. Ferris (Eds.), Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 4, 101-145.

Ford, D., Harris III, J. & Schuerger, J.M. (1993). Racial identity development among gifted black students: Counseling issues and concerns. Journal of Counseling & Development, 71(March/April), 409-417.

Fordham, S. (1988). Racelessness as a factor in Black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 54-84.

Fortune. (2000, April 17). 5Hundred Largest U.S. Corporations. F-1.

Frank, S.E. (1997). "It's official - Amex confirms heir apparent." Wall Street Journal, February 28, B, 1:6.

Friedman, R.A. & Carter, D. (1993). Working Paper: African American Network Groups: Their impact and effectiveness. Washington, D.C.: Executive Leadership Council.

Gecas, V. (1982). The self-concept. Annual Review of Sociology, 8, 1-33.

Garza, R.T. & Herring, L.G. (1987). Social identity: A multidimensional approach. Journal of Social Psychology, 127(3), 299-308.

Garza, R.T. & Romero, G.J. (1982). Biculturalism, locus of control, and leader behavior in ethnically mixed small groups. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 12(3), 237-253.

Glass Ceiling Commission. (1995). Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital. Washington, DC: Department of Labor.

Greene, J. (1993). "Black execs believe discrimination hinders their careers-survey." Modern Healthcare, 23(10), 4.

Greenhaus, J.H. & Parasuraman, S. (1993). Job performance and career advancement prospects: An examination of gender and race effects. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55, 273-297.

Greenhaus, J.H., Parasuraman, S. & Wormley, W.M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 33(1), 64-86.

Helms, J. (1990). An overview of Black racial identity theory. In J.E. Helms (Ed.), Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice (pp.67-80). New York: Greenwood Press.

Hocker, C. (2001, February). Newsmaker. Black Enterprise, p. 36.

Hodson, G. & Sorrentino, R. (1999). Uncertainty orientation and the big five personality structure. Journal of Research in Personality, 33, 253-261.

Hogg, M.A. & Abrams, D. (1988). Social identifications. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hunt, D.M. & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. Academy of Management Review, 3, 475-485.

Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. Academy of Management Review, 18(1), 56-87.

Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. Academy of Management Journal, 38(3), 673-703.

Ilgen, D.R. & Youtz, M.A. (1986) Factors affecting the evaluation and development of minorities in organizations. Personnel and Human Resource Management, 4, 307-337.

Jablin, F.M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F.M. Jablin, L.L. Putnam, K. Robert, & L. Porter (Eds.), Handbook of Organizational Communication (pp. 679-740). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Jaccard, J., Turrisi, R., & Wan, C.K. (1990). Interaction effects in multiple regression. New York: Sage Publications.

James, K. & Khoo, G. (1991). Identity-related influences on the success of minority workers in primarily nonminority organizations. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 13(2), 169-192.

Johnson, R. (1998, May 11). The 500's first black CEO. Fortune, 32.

Jones, G.R. (1983). Organizational socialization as information processing activity: A life history analysis. Human Organization, 42(4), 314-320.

Jones, G.R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 29(2), 262-279.

Jones, J.L. (1988). Black cultural orientation management mobility and productivity. In D. Thompson & N. DiTomaso (Eds.), Ensuring Minority Success in Corporate Management. New York: Plenum Press.

Jones, Jr., E.W. (1986). Black managers: The dream deferred. Harvard Business Review, 64(3), 84-93.

Kraiger, K. & Ford, J.K. (1985). A meta-analysis of ratee race effects in performance ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 56-65.

Kram, K.E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 608-625.

- LaFromboise, T, Coleman, H.L. & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. Psychological Bulletin, 114(3), 395-412.
- Landrine, H. & Klonoff, E.A. (1994). The African American Acculturation Scale: Development, reliability, and validity. Journal of Black Psychology, 20(2), 104-127.
- Landrine, H. & Klonoff, E.A. (1995). The African American Acculturation Scale II: Cross-validation and short form. Journal of Black Psychology, 21(2), 124-152.
- Leonard, R. & Locke, D.C. (1993). Communications stereotypes: Is interracial communication possible? Journal of Black Studies, 23(3), 332-343.
- Louis, M.R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 226-251.
- Louis, M.R., Posner, B.Z., & Powell, G.N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. Personnel Psychology, 36, 857-866.
- Luhtanen, R. & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 302-318.
- McKenna, K. Y.A. & Bargh, J.A. (1998). Coming out in the age of the Internet: Identity "demarginalization" through virtual group participation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75(3), 681-694.
- Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible Selves. American Psychologist, 41(9), 954-969.

Miller, V.D. & , F.M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. Academy of Management Review, 16(1), 92-120.

Morrison, A. (1992). The new leaders. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, Inc.

Morrison, A. & Von Glinow, M. (1990). Women and minorities in management. American Psychologist, 45(2), 200-208.

Morrison, E.W. (1993a). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(2), 173-183.

Morrison, E.W. (1993b). Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 36(3), 557-589.

Morrison, E.W. (1995). Information usefulness and acquisition during organizational encounter. Management Communication Quarterly, 9(2), 131-155.

Myers, L., Speight, S., Highlen, P., Cox, C., Reynolds, A., Adams, E. & Hanley, C. (1991). Identity development and worldview: Toward an optimal conceptualization. Journal of Counseling & Development, 70, 54-.

Nixon, R. (1985). Black managers in corporate America: Alienation or integration? Washington, D.C.: National Urban League.

Ogawa, D.M. (1971). Small-group communication stereotypes of Black Americans. Journal of Black Studies, 1, 273-281.

Ogbu, J. (1991). "Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective. In M. Gibson, & J. Ogbu (eds.) Minority status and schooling: A comparative study of immigrant and involuntary minorities.

Ostroff, C. & Kozlowski, S.W.J. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. Personnel Psychology, 45, 849-875.

Ostroff, C. & Kozlowski, S.W.J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42, 170-183.

Parham, T.A. & Austin, N.L. (1994). Career Development and African Americans: A contextual reappraisal using the nigrescence construct. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44, 139-154.

Parham, T.A. (1989). Cycles of psychological nigrescence. The Counseling Psychologist, 17(2), 187-226.

Philogene, G. (1999). From Black to African American: A new social representation. Westport, CT: Greenwood-Praeger.

Phinney, J. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. Psychological Bulletin, 108(3), 499-514.

Phinney, J. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. Journal of Adolescent Research, 7(2), 156-176.

Phinney, J. (1993). A three-stage model of ethnic identity development. In M. Bernal & G. Knight (Eds.), Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities (pp. 61-79). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Phinney, J. (1996). When we talk about ethnic groups, what do we mean? American Psychologist, 51, 918-927.

Phinney, J. & Alipuria, L. (1990). Ethnic identity in college students from four different groups. Journal of Adolescence, 13, 171-183.

Phinney, J. & Chavira, V. (1994). Ethnic identity and self-esteem: An exploratory longitudinal study. Journal of Adolescence, 15, 271-281.

Phinney, J., Chavira, V., & Tate, J. (1993). The effect of ethnic threat on ethnic self-concept and own-group ratings. The Journal of Social Psychology, 133(4), 469-478.

Phinney, J. & Tarver, S. (1988). Ethnic identity search and commitment in Black and White eighth graders. Journal of Early Adolescence, 8, 265-277.

Ravid, J. (1988). Black executives: How they're doing. Fortune, June 18, 109.

Reid, A. & Deaux, K. (1996). Relationship between social and personal identities: Segregation or integration? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(6) 1084-1091.

Rich, A.L. (1979). Interracial Communication. New York: Harper & Row.

Roberts, B-E. with Jack E. White. (1998). Roberts vs. Texaco. New York: Avon Books.

Roberts, R.E., Phinney, J., Masse, L, Chen, Y., Roberts, C & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. Journal of Early Adolescence, 19(3), 301-322.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.

Rosenberg, S. & Gara, M. (1985, reprint). The multiplicity of personal identity. In P. Shaver (Ed.), Self, situations, and social behavior, Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 87-113. California: Sage.

Ryder, A.G., Alden, L & Paulhus, D. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79, 49-65.

Sackett, P.R. & DuBois, C.L.Z. (1991). Rate-rater race effects on performance evaluation: Challenging meta-analytic conclusions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(6), 873-877.

Sackett, P.R., DuBois, C.L.Z. & Noe, A.W. (1991). Tokenism in performance evaluation: The effects of work group representation on male-female and White-Black differences in performance ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(2), 263-267.

Schein, E.H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. Industrial Management Review, 9(2), 1-10.

Schein, E. (1992, reprint). Defining organizational culture. In J.M. Shafritz & J.S. Ott (Eds.), Classics of organizational theory (3rd ed.), pp.490-502.

Sellers, R.M., Smith, M.A., Shelton, J.N., Rowley, S.A.J. & Chavous, T.M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2(1), 18-39.

Settoon, R.P. & Adkins, C.L. (1994). Making sense of unfamiliar surroundings: Inputs to sense-making and newcomers socialization. Paper from a presentation at the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychologists Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.

Singh, V. (1977). Some theoretical and methodological problems in the study of ethnic identity: A cross-cultural perspective. New York Academy of Sciences: Annals, 285, 32-42.

Stonequist, E.V. (1937). *The marginal man*. New York: Russell & Russell.

Stryker, S. (1980). Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version. Menlo Park: Benjamin/Cummings.

Stryker, S. (1987). Identity theory: Developments and extensions. In K. Yardley and T. Honess (Eds.), Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives (pp. 89-104). London: Wiley.

Tajfel, H. (ed.) (1978). Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of intergroup relations. London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human groups and social categories. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social identity and intergroup relations. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, M.S. & Giannantonio, C.M. (1993). Forming, adapting, and terminating the employment relationship: A review of the literature from individual, organizational, and interactionist perspectives. Journal of Management, 19(2), 461-515.

Teboul, J.C. B. (1994). Facing and coping with uncertainty during organizational encounter. Management Communication Quarterly, 8(2), 190-224.

Teboul, J.C. B. (1995). Determinants of new hire information-seeking during organizational encounter. Western Journal of Communication, 59, 305-325.

Teboul, J.C. B. (1997a). Racial/ethnic "encounter" in the workplace: Uncertainty, information-seeking and learning patterns among racial/ethnic majority and minority new hires. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, San Diego, California.

Teboul, J.C. B. (1997b). "Scripting" the organization: New hire learning during organizational encounter. Communication Research Reports, 14(1), 33-47.

Thoits, P. (1983). Multiple identities and psychological well-being: A reformulation and test of the social isolation hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 48, 174-187.

Thomas, D.A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, 479-492.

Thompson, D., Morrison, A.M., & Iwata, K. (1994). Views. Unpublished instrument, New Leaders Institute.

Tucker, S.H. (1994, August 31). Black women in corporate America: Executive women discuss real-life. Black Enterprise, 60.

Valentine, C. (1971). Deficit, difference and bicultural models of Afro-American behavior. Harvard Educational Review, 41, 137-157.

Van Maanen, J. & Schein, E. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 1, pp.209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Vontress, C.E. (1971). Racial differences: Impediments to rapport. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18(1), 7-13.

Wanous, J.P. (1992). Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, orientation and socialization of newcomers (2nd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, pp. 187-224.

Waters, M.C. (1990). Ethnic Options. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

Weathers, D. (1997, October). Corporate race wars. Essence, 81.

Whigham-Desir, M. & Clarke, R. (2000, February). The top 50 Blacks in Corporate America. Black Enterprise, 107.

Whittler, T.E., Calantone, R.J. & Young, M.R. (1991). Strength of ethnic identification affiliation: Examining Black identification with Black culture. The Journal of Social Psychology, 131(4), 461-467.

Williams, L. (1987). For the Black professional, the obstacles remain. New York Times, July 14: A16.

Zimet, G., Dahlem, N., Zimet, S. & Farley, G. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. Journal of Personality Assessment, 52(1), 30-41.

Zimet, G., Powell, S., Farley, G., Werkman, S. & Berkoff, K. (1990). Psychometric characteristics of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support. Journal of Personality Assessment, 55(3&4), 610-617.