1994

Cultural diversity in the workplace

Nigel Tak Tai Lor
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Lor, Nigel Tak Tai, "Cultural diversity in the workplace" (1994). *Master's Theses*. 776.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.mqqv-u7hr>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/776

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

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. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

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.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1358200

Cultural diversity in the workplace

Lor, Nigel Tak Tai, M.S.

San Jose State University, 1994

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN THE WORKPLACE

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Nigel Tak Tai Lor

May, 1994

© 1994

Nigel Tak Tai Lor

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Howard Tokunaga, Ph.D.

Lori Bartels, Ph.D.

Tomas Martinez, Ph.D.

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT
CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN THE WORKPLACE
by Nigel T. Lor

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of diversity training programs of organizations in the Silicon Valley. Ninety-five respondents completed a survey addressing the issues of promotion and hiring of minorities and women, as well as race and gender preference of supervisors and co-workers.

Results of 2 x 2 ANOVAs showed that the existence of diversity training workshops was not related to the workers' perceptions of the hiring and promotion practices of their organizations; race, however, was related to the workers' perceptions of the hiring and promotion practices of their organizations. Chi square statistics also showed that there was no relationship between workshops and employees' supervisor or co-worker preference. These findings have implications for executives who have spent or are planning to spend time, money, and personnel to manage cultural diversity in the workplace.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.....	3
Characteristics of the Work Force of the Future	3
Early Organizational Theories of Work Force Diversity	4
Later Organizational Theories of Work Force Diversity.....	6
Minorities and Women	7
Representation of Minorities and Women in Corporate America.....	9
Organizational Interventions.....	9
Recent Research.....	11
Purpose of This Study	13
METHOD.....	14
Subjects	14
Materials	14
Procedure	15
RESULTS	15
DISCUSSION	30
Implications of This Study.....	31
Strengths and Limitations.....	32
Future Research.....	34
REFERENCES	35
APPENDICES	37
Appendix A. Cover Letter and Survey	37
Appendix B. Signed Approval Form	42

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Numbers of Workers in Organizations With or Without Diversity Workshops	16
2. Company's Rating in Promotions by Ethnicity and Workshop	18
3. Company's Rating in Promotions by Gender and Workshop	20
4. Unique Obstacles to Promotion for Minorities and Women	23
5. Company's Rating in Recruitments by Ethnicity and Workshop	24
6. Company's Rating in Recruitments by Gender and Workshop	26
7. Gender Supervision Preference of Employees from Organizations With or Without Workshops	29

Cultural Diversity in the Workplace

Nigel Tak Tai Lor

San Jose State University

Running head: CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Footnotes

**Requests for reprints should be sent to Nigel T. Lor, Department of Psychology,
San Jose State University, San Jose, California 95192**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of diversity training programs of organizations in the Silicon Valley. Ninety-five respondents completed a survey addressing the issues of promotion and hiring of minorities and women, as well as race and gender preference of supervisors and co-workers. Results of 2 x 2 ANOVAs showed that the existence of diversity training workshops was not related to the workers' perceptions of the hiring and promotion practices of their organizations; race, however, was related to the workers' perceptions of the hiring and promotion practices of their organizations. Chi square statistics also showed that there was no relationship between workshops and employees' supervisor or co-worker preference. These findings have implications for executives who have spent or are planning to spend time, money, and personnel to manage cultural diversity in the workplace.

Cultural Diversity in the Workplace

One of the key elements in managing organizational behavior entails the understanding of the culture to which the workers belong. Schein (1992) defines organizational culture as any pattern of shared basic assumptions a group learns as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid to teach to new members the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. According to Hofstede (1980), managers tend to see culture as the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one work group from another, the interactive aggregate of common characteristics that influences a work group's response to its environment. However, the notion of homogeneity of an organizational culture is a thing of the past. Corporations and organizations are becoming more and more multicultural in nature, not only as a result of the international or global market, but also because employee and client populations are typically comprised of more than one culture. Moreover, the entry of women into the labor force has helped alter the composition of most corporations in this country. The purpose of this study is to examine how organizations are coping with work force diversity.

Characteristics of the Work Force of the Future

Demographic changes in the U. S. population have and will continue to alter the ethnic and gender makeup of Corporate America. For example, ethnic and racial minorities are predicted to grow seven times faster than the caucasian population (Williams, 1990). This is partially a result of the constant flow of immigrants into the country. These minorities and immigrants will comprise a large proportion of new entrants into the labor

pool. Already, one in every four Americans is non-caucasian, and multicultural groups have become the majority population in major metropolitan centers such as Atlanta, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, San Francisco, and Washington, D. C. (Wong, 1991). In fact, it is projected that by the year 2000, caucasian males will comprise only 45 percent of the total U. S. labor force and only 15 percent of new entrants into the work force (Jones, 1988).

Another important demographic trend is the rising number of women in the work force. Today women make up 44 percent of all workers, even though the number of managerial positions filled by them is less proportionate (Fine, Johnson, & Ryan, 1990). According to Weckler (1991) and Kleiman (1991), in the next ten years women more than other groups will enter the work force and be hired for over half of the new jobs. Corporations will have to change at all levels of the hierarchy to adjust to this trend.

Another key element of the changing labor pool corporations have to contend with is the diminished qualifications of the new entrants. While the fastest growing job markets will be in the professional, technical, and sales fields, increasing numbers of work force entrants are unprepared in even the most basic skills, such as English and mathematics (Weckler, 1991). The labor pool will increasingly be comprised of disadvantaged minorities with low economic and educational levels. It has been estimated that every year, between 700,000 and 750,000 graduating high school students cannot read their diplomas (Jones, 1988). This "skills gap" is projected to widen drastically.

Early Organizational Theories of Work Force Diversity

The changing composition of the labor force, in terms of ethnicity and gender, has made businesses and organizations reconsider their views on diversity in the workplace. In the past, American businesses have sought work force homogeneity where the workers

believed in, supported, and presented a particular image (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992). Early organizational theorists assumed that workers share or ought to share values, beliefs, and attitudes about work in general and the organization for which they work in particular (Fine, Johnson, & Ryan, 1990). In fact, organizational theorists and managers believed that individual differences should be eliminated. Workers, regardless of gender or race, should strive to be similar.

For many years, Corporate America adopted the "white male" model for the workplace. Managers used job incumbents, or those who already held positions in organizations, as role models because they possessed the appropriate skills and behaviors required for these positions. These job incumbents were typically white men, and newcomers to the organization were required to possess or at least adopt skills and behaviors exhibited by those already there. According to Fine, Johnson, and Ryan (1990), the logical conclusion of such ideology was the assumption that difference is deficient. This view implied that minorities and women possessed inferior skills and therefore, would need training to succeed in the corporate arena.

Interestingly, the American culture has espoused the notions of "all men are created equal," but in reality, minorities and women have had to assimilate into the predominant white male mainstream (Edwards, 1991). It is important to note that this statement was written by caucasian men at a time when diversity was not an issue. Even though equality had been stated as a guiding principle in American life, this has not been reflected in the workplace. Success depended on how well minorities and women were able to imitate the behaviors of caucasian men, who were considered to possess superior skills.

Later Organizational Theories of Work Force Diversity

Although the white male model for the workplace worked in the past, it is clear that differences in individuals do not necessarily equate to deficiency. This became apparent to organizational theorists when they discovered similarities between the skills demanded by Japanese management techniques and the ones traditionally associated with women, such as listening, empathy, attention to non-verbal skills, cooperation, and non-authoritarian leadership (Fine, Johnson, & Ryan, 1990). In other words, it was believed that the introduction of women, or rather the feminine model, into the corporate arena would actually improve organizational functioning. The shift from "difference as deficient" perspective to one of "difference as better" may be crucial to the survival of American businesses since the labor force is no longer dominated by caucasian men, but by women and minority members.

It is important to realize that affirmative action and valuing cultural diversity are two different things. The former refers to any organizational policy or program for correcting the effects of past discrimination in the employment or education of members of certain groups. There has been notoriety with affirmative action because employees who enter an organization under it may feel there is suspicion that they would not be there if the affirmative action policy had not existed (Edwards, 1991). However, minorities and women can use it as an entry point to prove they deserved to be there. Valuing diversity, on the other hand, refers to a recognition and appreciation of a diverse labor force. The differences are not to be simply tolerated, but encouraged and supported (Williams, 1990). Therefore, managing or valuing diversity are not merely new words for affirmative action

or equal employment opportunity, rather they reflect the desire of organizations to focus on the future instead of the past.

Minorities and Women

Although minority members and women have been conveniently grouped together for the sake of simplicity, it is imperative to remember that each group has its unique cultural characteristics. The purpose of the next section is to examine the different minorities as they are most often grouped in existing literature.

Asian-Americans

The Asian-American culture tends to embrace a cautious behavior style. Asian-Americans are taught not to "shoot from the hip," to be non-confrontational, think before they speak, and make sure they are right (Edwards, 1991). However, Corporate America seems to view them as dependable and diligent workers but are not assertive enough to be managers (Dwyer, 1991). According to David Lam, the Asian president and CEO of Link Technologies, Asians are looked on as "workhorses," but not "race horses" (Nhu, 1992). Moreover, many assumed that the Asian's verbal communication skills are not as proficient as others if they speak with an accent.

Hispanics

Hispanics make up one of the largest demographic groups in the United States today. The Hispanic culture is characterized by a common language and religion (Mowen, 1987). Traditionally, Hispanics have been described as loyal and hard-working employees, and above all, very family-oriented (Kleiman, 1991). Relationships are very important in the Hispanic community. There is a need to have some knowledge of who that other person is in order to work together. In terms of behavioral styles, Hispanics tend

to be verbal people in their native language, for they like to influence and persuade.

According to Edwards (1991), they are the cheerleaders: "I can, you can, we can make a difference." However, language and fear of hiring illegal immigrants have been a major impediment to good jobs for many Hispanics.

African-Americans

African-Americans, like other minority groups, have not overcome discrimination in Corporate America. The African-American culture has been characterized by education, job, and income deprivation. Language is still a problem for many African-Americans because the lack of willingness or motivation to speak standard English has been equated with intellectual deficiency (Kleiman, 1991). Moreover, they have had to fight the myth that they are hired only to meet affirmative action quotas.

Women

Women, on the other hand, have been handicapped by the sex-role stereotype. Sex-role stereotype refers to the belief that men and women differ in their traits and abilities, thus making men and women more suited to different roles. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (1992), women have been traditionally perceived as relatively less competent, less independent, less objective, and less logical than their male counterparts. However, in comparison, men have been perceived as lacking warmth, sensitivity and expressiveness. Most importantly, masculine traits may be considered more desirable than feminine traits, especially in the workplace (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992). Since feminine traits may be less valued in the workplace, women tend to possess more negative self-concepts than men.

Sex-role stereotypes, however, are gross oversimplifications of perceptions. Men and women do not systematically differ as suggested by the traditional stereotypes, although they may define and organize their world in different ways (Fine, Johnson, & Ryan, 1990). In general, women, due to their skills in influencing and persuading others, are better at participative management (Edwards, 1991). As more and more women enter into the labor force, corporations will have to become more collaborative, conciliatory, and team-oriented (Thornburg, 1991). Organizations will become more "people-oriented" than "task-oriented."

Representation of Minorities and Women in Corporate America

Even though minorities and women comprise a major sector of the U. S. work force, they have not fared as well in the corporate world. A 1990 federal study of 94 major corporations indicated that only 6 percent of managers were minorities and 17 percent were women (Kleiman, 1992). The number of directors was even smaller with minorities and women comprising only 5 percent and 7 percent, respectively (Galen & Palmer, 1994). In short, Corporate America is still being run by caucasian males.

The term frequently used for this phenomenon is "glass ceiling." The glass ceiling is an invisible barrier, real or perceived, that effectively keeps minorities and women clustered in low-level jobs (Kleiman, 1992). More importantly, it is believed that the mere ethnicity or sex of an individual may prevent that individual from advancing to the top ranks. Discrimination based on race and gender is still pervasive today.

Organizational Interventions

The question is no longer whether or not minorities and women are going to impact the corporate world, but whether or not organizations are ready for them. Although

corporate attitudes towards women and ethnic minorities have changed dramatically, how exactly have organizations addressed or managed work force diversity? While some Fortune 500 companies have barely addressed the issue, other corporations have taken great steps to create and foster a climate where cultural, racial, and gender differences are valued. For example, at Allstate Insurance Company's office in Northbrook, Illinois, managers conducted a survey of their employees to investigate and gauge sentiments about diversity as well as to validate the need for training in this area. Allstate purchased and distributed training video tapes on "valuing diversity" to the company's many regional centers and conducted leadership workshops on skills for managing employees of diverse cultures (Williams, 1990). Moreover, support groups involving employees with similar cultural backgrounds were formed and the members meet regularly to share ideas and lend support. It is interesting to note that they have been trying to address diversity in the workplace by segregating employees based on gender and ethnicity. Furthermore, the effectiveness of this program has not been documented.

The support of top management is crucial for any organizational intervention to have long-term success. Xerox's top executives are committed champions of change; they developed long-term balanced work force goals as a corporate strategy, not merely a staff function. A balanced work force means achieving and maintaining equitable representation of all employee groups at all levels, in all functions, and in all organizations (Sessa, 1992). Moreover, minorities and women formed caucus groups that served as a vehicle for employee involvement in managing diversity, as well as being self-help support groups. Xerox also implemented training programs that emphasized developing managers to better manage all employees. Furthermore, after realizing that minorities and women were not

upwardly mobile, top management targeted two to five key positions that were critical to becoming senior managers for minorities and women.

Allstate Insurance Company and Xerox are by no means the only companies that have developed specific policies and programs based on their commitment to valuing work force diversity. Corporations across the nation have established other ways to assuage the discomfort of women and minority members in their working environment. For example, Avon and US West encourage cultural groups to arrange celebratory events that bring employees of all backgrounds together for ethnic foods and dancing. Corning Incorporated, on the other hand, focuses on job enrichment where new minority employees are rotated through different jobs during the first five years which enables them to obtain experience they need for future promotions (Livingston, 1991). Moreover, some firms have established job-sharing arrangements which would allow female employees to continue on their career tracks as well as meeting their familial responsibilities. Perhaps sex-role stereotyping is the main reason why most of the job-sharing arrangements are aimed towards women. Organizational policies and programs that corporations have implemented are varied and are by no means limited.

Recent Research

One of the best ways to probe employees' perception of and attitude towards employment issues for minority members and women is to conduct an attitude survey. Fine, Johnson, and Ryan (1990) explored workers' perceptions of their organizational experiences in a regional branch of a federal agency using an extensive questionnaire. In light of the fact that their study was exploratory in nature, the researchers were able to identify some issues which pertain to women and minorities.

Perhaps the most significant finding Fine et al. (1990) discovered was that caucasian men, women, and minority members do not share a common culture of organizational life. Instead, each group identified and experienced organizational life in unique ways. Moreover, the different groups seemed to be unable to understand the experiences of others since they had different cultural upbringings. The workers' perception of the organizational culture was heavily influenced by their racial group affiliation. According to the researchers, the findings were also partially a result of the differences in the context of organizational life. For example, women held more lower level positions than their counterparts in the regional branch; consequently, they viewed the organization from the bottom of the hierarchy. Minority employees, on the other hand, were few in number and they tended to see the firm in isolation from other minority members.

Another factor that accounted for the discrepancies in the workers' organizational experiences entailed their communication networks. The results of the study showed that each group seemed most comfortable communicating with members of their own group. In other words, men tended to share information with other men, women with other women, and minorities with other minorities. According to Fine et al. (1990), information workers receive is contingent upon their access to communication networks, and each group is likely to receive different information with which to interpret its organizational life. For example, the authors actually found nearly 25 percent of the female employees had experienced at least one incident of sexual harassment, but these women were reluctant to talk about it with male workers. And since women did not share this information with their male colleagues or supervisors, the male employees were more apt to believe that sexual

harassment did not exist in the branch. In fact, this statistic was supported by a study conducted on Fortune 500 companies, where only two percent of the male managers believed sexual harassment existed as compared to 75 percent of their female counterparts (Scimens & Pederson, 1992). Perhaps the communication network is one of the main reasons why caucasian males usually have the "power" information.

Purpose of This Study

Existing research has revealed important changes of the future work force. Most notably, women and minorities will comprise a major proportion of new entrants into the labor force. Moreover, research has shown that organizations in the United States have addressed this issue differently; while some have ignored it, others have implemented specific programs and workshops to foster a climate where cultural, racial, and gender differences are not only tolerated, but valued. However, despite the myriad of interventions organizations have implemented, their effectiveness has largely been undocumented.

The purpose of this study is to explore how organizations in the Silicon Valley are managing work force diversity, and to determine whether men, women, and minorities still have different perceptions of their organizational culture even if corporations have addressed the issue with training programs. For example, do race and gender still play a role in employees' attitudes towards promotion opportunities in corporations where diversity training programs have been established? The Silicon Valley is chosen because it is a region characterized by a very diverse population composition; ethnic minorities and women are becoming more and more visible in the corporate arena, whether the organizations are prepared for them or not. It is hypothesized that employees in

corporations with and without diversity training programs have different perceptions of their organizational culture. More specifically, it is expected that:

Hypothesis 1: Workers of organizations with and without diversity training will rate their company differently in promotion and hiring practices of minorities and women.

Hypothesis 2: Workers in organizations with and without diversity training will have different preferences regarding the ethnicity and gender of their supervisors and co-workers.

The results of this study will help gauge the overall effectiveness of the diversity training programs in this region.

Method

Subjects

Of the 350 employees in various organizations located in the Silicon Valley who were randomly selected as subjects for this study, 101 (29%) actually returned the survey. They were grouped according to gender and race. Subjects had to be at least eighteen years of age and be able to read English. They participated in a survey on a voluntary basis with no compensation for their involvement. Subjects were treated in accordance with the Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board's regulations of San Jose State University.

Materials

A questionnaire was used to assess the subjects' perception of their organizational life. The questionnaire employed was a modification of the one developed by Fine et al. (1990), which addressed the issues of representation of minorities and women in managerial positions, unique obstacles to promotion for minorities and women, as well as

race or gender supervision/co-worker preference. The survey instrument was comprised of closed-ended and fill-in-the-blank questions. A cover letter stating the purpose of the study also accompanied the questionnaire (See Appendix A).

Procedure

Two distribution methods were employed for this study; the majority of surveys were mailed out to subjects in the Silicon Valley and the remainder were handed out to a classroom audience. All subjects were asked to fill out and complete the survey instrument. A cover letter stating the purpose of the study as well as questionnaire instructions was included with the survey. Those subjects who received the survey by mail filled out the questionnaire and returned the completed form to the researcher in a self-addressed envelope, while surveys completed by subjects in class were collected by the researcher. No time limit was placed on subjects who completed the survey in class.

Results

Although the response rate for the survey was 29%, not all cases were used in all analyses due to missing data. Approximately 95 cases were used in each analysis.

Descriptive statistics of workers in organizations with diversity workshops and workers of organizations without workshops are listed in Table 1. The majority of the respondents were white (68), with the number of females (57) slightly higher than the number of males (41). In light of the fact that the number of minorities (Blacks, Asians, Hispanics, Persians, American Indians) was small, they comprised a single category rather than separate categories based on ethnicity.

Table 1

Numbers of Workers in Organizations With or Without Diversity Workshops

	<u>With Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	
<u>Race</u>			
White	28 (65.1%)	40 (76.9%)	
Non-White	15 (34.9%)	12 (23.1%)	
<u>Total</u>	43 (100%)	52 (100%)	

	<u>With Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Race</u>			
White	28 (41.2%)	40 (58.8%)	68 (100%)
Non-White	15 (55.6%)	12 (44.4%)	27 (100%)

Promotion of Minorities and Women

To test the hypothesis that workers of organizations with and without diversity training rate their organizations differently in promotion and hiring practices of minorities and women, two 2 x 2 ANOVAs were computed to examine the main effects of Workshops, Ethnicity, and Gender. The first ANOVA tested Workshop by Ethnicity and the second ANOVA tested Workshop by Gender. In regards to the promotion of minorities, the main effect of Workshop was not significant in the first ANOVA (Workshop by Ethnicity) [$F(1,89) = 1.10$, n.s.], nor in the second ANOVA (Workshop by Gender) [$F(1,92) = .58$, n.s.] (see Tables 2 and 3). The main effect of Ethnicity was also non-significant; however, the trend shows that whites scored their organizations higher than did minorities [$F(1,89) = 3.46$, $p = .07$].

In terms of promotion of women, the main effect of Workshop was not significant in the first ANOVA (Workshop by Ethnicity) [$F(1,90) = 1.78$, n.s.], nor in the second ANOVA (Workshop by Gender) [$F(1,93) = .02$, n.s.] (see Tables 2 and 3). However, the main effect of Ethnicity was significant, with whites giving higher ratings for their company's record in promoting women than did minorities [$F(1,90) = 8.83$, $p = .004$]. The main effect of Gender, on the other hand, was non-significant [$F(1,93) = 3.10$, n.s.].

The results also show that workshops did not have a significant effect on the workers' response regarding the promotion of white males in the first ANOVA [$F(1,90) = .13$, n.s.], nor in the second ANOVA [$F(1,93) = .11$, n.s.]. Ethnicity seems to be a bigger factor in determining the workers' response, with minorities giving higher ratings for their company's record in promoting white males than did whites [$F(1,90) = 3.56$, $p = .06$].

Table 2

Company's Rating in Promotions by Ethnicity and WorkshopCompany's Rating in Promoting Minorities

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Whites</u>	3.50	3.34	3.42
	(.88)	(1.17)	(1.06)
<u>Minorities</u>	3.13	2.75	2.96
	(1.19)	(1.36)	(1.26)
<u>Total</u>	3.32	3.12	
	(1.05)	(1.28)	

Company's Rating in Promoting Women

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Whites</u>	3.54	3.69	3.63
	(1.14)	(1.06)	(1.09)
<u>Minorities</u>	3.27	2.42	2.89
	(1.16)	(1.31)	(1.28)
<u>Total</u>	3.39	3.38	
	(1.19)	(1.23)	

Table 2 (continued)

Company's Rating in Promotions by Ethnicity and WorkshopCompany's Rating in Promoting White Males

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Whites</u>	4.11	4.08	4.11
	(.83)	(1.01)	(.96)
<u>Minorities</u>	4.53	4.42	4.48
	(.74)	(.67)	(.70)
<u>Total</u>	4.27	4.19	
	(.82)	(.94)	

Table 3
Company's Rating in Promotions by Gender and Workshop

Company's Rating in Promoting Minorities

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Males</u>	3.29	3.25	3.29
	(1.11)	(1.26)	(1.17)
<u>Females</u>	3.33	3.00	3.18
	(1.04)	(1.31)	(1.20)
<u>Total</u>	3.32	3.12	
	(1.05)	(1.28)	

Company's Rating in Promoting Women

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Males</u>	3.65	3.63	3.64
	(1.00)	(1.14)	(1.06)
<u>Females</u>	3.22	3.17	3.21
	(1.28)	(1.28)	(1.28)
<u>Total</u>	3.39	3.38	
	(1.19)	(1.23)	

Table 3 (continued)

Company's Rating in Promotions by Gender and WorkshopCompany's Rating in Promoting White Males

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Males</u>	4.12	4.13	4.12
	(.86)	(.85)	(.83)
<u>Females</u>	4.37	4.24	4.33
	(.79)	(1.02)	(.91)
<u>Total</u>	4.27	4.19	
	(.82)	(.94)	

Even though the main effect of Workshop was not a factor in the subjects' response to the promotion of minorities and women, chi square statistics were computed to determine if there are differences in their opinions regarding unique obstacles to promotion faced by minorities and women in the workplace. Although not statistically significant, Table 4 indicates a trend showing that a greater number of workers from organizations with training perceived minorities as facing stereotyping and lacking mentoring programs than did workers from organizations without such training. Conversely, more workers from organizations without training believed minorities did not encounter unique obstacles to promotion than did workers of organizations with training.

Similarly, a trend exists where a greater number of workers in organizations with diversity training perceived women as facing stereotyping, family duties, and lacking mentoring programs than did workers of organizations without diversity training. Although not statistically significant, the trend in Table 4 indicates that more workers in organizations without workshops believed women did not encounter unique obstacles to promotion than did workers from organizations with workshops.

Recruitment of Minorities and Women

The results also show that workshops did not have a significant impact on the subjects' response regarding their company's recruitment of minorities in the first ANOVA (Workshop by Ethnicity) [$F(1,91) = .01$, n.s.], nor in the second ANOVA (Workshop by Gender) [$F(1,94) = .01$, n.s.] (see Tables 5 and 6). However, Ethnicity seems to be able to account for the differences in means, with whites giving higher ratings for their company's record in recruiting minorities than non-whites [$F(1,91) = 4.54$, $p = .04$].

Table 4

Unique Obstacles to Promotion for Minorities and WomenObstacles Faced by Minorities

	<u>With Workshop</u> (n = 44)	<u>Without Workshop</u> (n = 53)	χ^2	sig
White Male Culture/Network	45.5%	43.4%	.00	1.00
Stereotyping	36.4%	26.4%	.70	.40
Lack of Mentoring Programs	29.5%	18.9%	.98	.32
Minorities Don't Face Unique Obstacles	34.1%	39.6%	.12	.73

Obstacles Faced by Women

	<u>With Workshop</u> (n = 44)	<u>Without Workshop</u> (n = 54)	χ^2	sig
White Male Culture/Network	47.7%	48.1%	.00	1.00
Stereotyping	34.1%	27.8%	.20	.65
Maternal and Family Duties	47.7%	29.6%	2.65	.10
Lack of Mentoring Programs	31.8%	22.2%	.71	.40
Women Don't Face Unique Obstacles	25.0%	40.7%	2.03	.15

Table 5

Company's Rating in Recruitments by Ethnicity and WorkshopCompany's Rating in Recruiting Minorities

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Whites</u>	3.68	3.50	3.59
	(.86)	(1.11)	(1.01)
<u>Minorities</u>	2.93	3.17	3.04
	(1.39)	(1.19)	(1.29)
<u>Total</u>	3.39	3.37	
	(1.13)	(1.14)	

Company's Rating in Recruiting Women

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Whites</u>	3.54	3.75	3.68
	(1.11)	(1.03)	(1.05)
<u>Minorities</u>	3.33	2.92	3.15
	(1.11)	(1.08)	(1.10)
<u>Total</u>	3.43	3.54	
	(1.11)	(1.09)	

Table 5 (continued)

Company's Rating in Recruitments by Ethnicity and WorkshopCompany's Rating in Recruiting White Males

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Whites</u>	3.79	3.90	3.87
	(.88)	(.91)	(.88)
<u>Minorities</u>	4.00	4.08	4.04
	(.76)	(.79)	(.76)
<u>Total</u>	3.89	3.98	
	(.84)	(.89)	

Table 6

Company's Rating in Recruitments by Gender and WorkshopCompany's Rating in Recruiting Minorities

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Males</u>	3.47	3.42	3.45
	(1.01)	(1.14)	(1.06)
<u>Females</u>	3.33	3.33	3.33
	(1.21)	(1.16)	(1.17)
<u>Total</u>	3.39	3.37	
	(1.13)	(1.14)	

Company's Rating in Recruiting Women

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Males</u>	3.47	3.63	3.57
	(.94)	(1.10)	(1.02)
<u>Females</u>	3.41	3.47	3.46
	(1.22)	(1.11)	(1.15)
<u>Total</u>	3.43	3.54	
	(1.11)	(1.09)	

Table 6 (continued)

Company's Rating in Recruitments by Gender and WorkshopCompany's Rating in Recruiting White Males

	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Without Workshop</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>	<u>(S.D.)</u>
<u>Males</u>	3.82	3.79	3.81
	(.88)	(.88)	(.86)
<u>Females</u>	3.93	4.14	4.05
	(.83)	(.88)	(.85)
<u>Total</u>	3.89	3.98	
	(.84)	(.89)	

In terms of recruitment of women, the main effect of Workshop was not significant in the first ANOVA [$F(1,91) = .17$, n.s.], nor in the second ANOVA [$F(1,94) = .22$, n.s.]. But, as Table 5 indicates, Ethnicity does affect the subjects' response as whites scored their organizations higher in the recruitment of women than minorities [$F(1,91) = 4.42$, $p = .04$].

Workshops were not a factor in determining the differences in the subjects' response to their company's record in recruiting white males. The main effect of Workshop was not significant in the first ANOVA [$F(1,90) = .24$, n.s.], nor in the second ANOVA [$F(1,93) = .25$, n.s.]. The main effects of Ethnicity and Gender were also not significant.

Co-worker and Supervisor Preference

To test the hypothesis that workers in organizations with and without diversity training have different race and gender preferences of their supervisors and co-workers, chi square statistics were computed. In terms of supervision preference, 70.4% of workers in organizations without diversity training said they have no preference concerning the gender of their supervisors, as compared to 65.9% of those in organizations that have programs dealing with diversity (see Table 7). However, this difference was not significant [$\chi^2(2) = .24$, $p = .89$]. In general, both employees with and without workshops expressed no gender supervision preference. But those who did express a preference, both with and without workshops, prefer to be supervised by men. Chi square statistics were not computed for the other variables dealing with ethnicity and gender preference at work due to the fact that 75% of the cells have too small a number of cases which would have rendered the statistics invalid.

Table 7

Gender Supervision Preference of Employees from Organizations With or Without Workshops

	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Either Men or Women</u>
With Workshop (n = 44)	22.7%	11.4%	65.9%
Without Workshop (n = 54)	20.4%	9.3%	70.4%

$$\chi^2 = .24 \quad df = 2 \quad p = .89$$

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gauge the overall effectiveness of diversity training programs in the Silicon Valley. This section will discuss the findings in more detail, as well as their implications. In addition, the author discusses the strengths and limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.

The first hypothesis, that workers of organizations with and without diversity training score their organizations differently in promotion and hiring practices of minorities and women, was not supported by the findings. Specifically, workers of organizations with and without workshops gave similar ratings for their organization's record in promotion of minorities and women. Race, on the other hand, did significantly account for most of the differences in the workers' responses, as whites gave their companies higher ratings than did minorities.

In terms of the obstacles to promotion faced by minorities and women, there was a consistent pattern of results. Although not statistically significant, the findings showed that more workers from organizations with training perceived minorities and women as facing obstacles to promotion, such as stereotyping, lacking mentoring programs, and in the case of women, family duties, than did workers from organizations without diversity training.

Workshops did not have a significant impact on the workers' response regarding their company's record in recruitment of minorities and women. Race, however, did again affect the subjects' response, with whites scoring their organizations significantly higher in the recruitment of minorities and women than did minorities.

Several patterns are evident in the overall findings. First, the effect of workshops was not significant; in other words, the differences in responses between the workers of

organizations with and without training were small. Second and more importantly, race was a better predictor of responses than workshop. On matters of promotion and recruitment, each group believed that the other had an advantage. The workers' perceptions of their organizational culture were influenced by the racial group to which they belong.

The second hypothesis, that workers in organizations with and without diversity training have different preferences regarding the ethnicity and gender of their supervisors and co-workers, was also not supported. Both workers from organizations with and without training tended to express no ethnicity or gender preference. Unlike what was expected, however, the trend shows that more workers from organizations without workshops have no preference regarding race or gender of supervisors and co-workers than workers from organizations with workshops.

Implications of This Study

One possible explanation for the similarity of responses given by workers of organizations with and without workshops is that workshops or diversity training are largely ineffective. The findings seem to suggest that workshops did bring about some awareness of the unique obstacles that minorities and women face, but it brought little change in behavior because there is still a disparity in terms of promotions and hiring of these groups. The level of commitment by top management is crucial; are workshops mere "window-dressing" to appear as though the organization is attempting to cope with the diverse work force or are their sincere efforts just not effective? Unfortunately, this study cannot answer this question. Many programs are too new to lend themselves to any meaningful evaluation. Furthermore, it is difficult to assess any organizational intervention

because of the expense involved, not to mention that many training managers may not know how to go about evaluating training programs (Wexley & Latham, 1991). Some top management may not require evaluation because they presume the workshops are useful and they do not want to know otherwise.

Another possibility for the similarity of answers given by workers of organizations with and without workshops is that cultural diversity is not an issue in the Silicon Valley. Perhaps the workers believe there are no real differences between members of different races and sexes which would render diversity training meaningless. This is unlikely, though, since there was an ethnicity difference in response for the promotion and recruitment of minorities and women. Moreover, promotion and hiring disparities between whites and minorities, as well as between males and females, have been well documented.

Strengths and Limitations

The main strengths of this study are directly related to its design. In light of the fact that the purpose of the study was to examine the overall effectiveness of training programs in the Silicon Valley, employees from many different organizations participated. The data obtained was derived from a diverse group of individuals and organizations. Another advantage is that subjects were provided with a sense of anonymity, thus allowing them to respond openly to sensitive questions. Respondents did not have to fear repercussions since their answers would not be traceable to them.

In looking at the results of the study, however, limitations must also be taken into consideration. The first and foremost limitation concerned the quality of the data. The small sample size, due to a low response rate and time restraints of the study, made any generalizations based on the data questionable. The sample size could be increased by

enlarging the original sample. Moreover, since the survey was not coded or tracked, it is impossible to determine if the respondents were representative of the total sample or of the larger population. Respondents may differ in important ways from nonrespondents; for example, they may have responded because they had strong opinions on cultural diversity in the workplace.

Another limitation of the study could be traced to the accuracy of responses. Did social desirability play a role with the subjects? In other words, did they respond in what is perceived as the socially accepted direction? The survey instrument used in this study did not have a scale to test for social desirability. Even if social desirability was not a factor, the accuracy of subjects' recollections is always questionable. It is impossible to determine if the subjects' responses actually reflected the reality of their respective organizational culture.

A third limitation of the study deals with the criteria for measurement. It is possible that the criteria chosen in this study may not be the most appropriate ones to measure the effectiveness of training programs. This survey examined employees' perceptions, as opposed to more objective data, such as personnel records, that can eliminate bias inherent in opinion-based studies. The choice of criteria for measurement is important in any research study.

Another limitation pertains to the design of the study. Since the study was not designed to examine individual programs, there was no way to determine which organizations had effective diversity programs and which did not. There is no knowledge of the characteristics of the organizations involved which would render the findings of

limited use to individual organizations. The current study provides an overall picture of the diversity programs in the Silicon Valley.

Future Research

Regarding future research, the author suggests that companies in the Silicon Valley perform their own separate studies to determine whether or not they need diversity training, and if they already have a diversity program in place, how effective the program is. If the training program is found to be ineffective, studies should be conducted to determine areas for change. Follow-up studies should be conducted periodically to determine if there is transferability of skills acquired through training.

Cultural diversity will be a prevailing topic in the years to come as minorities and women begin to climb the corporate ladder. Executives will be challenged to meet not only organizational needs, but also the needs of a diverse work force. This study has shown that there is an ethnic disparity in perception of organizations' promotion and hiring practices, and the question remains whether minorities, women, and white males will ever be accepted and treated as equals.

References

- Dwyer, P. (1991, October/November). Other minorities demand their due. High Technology Careers Magazine, p. 28.
- Edwards, A. (1991). The enlightened manager: How to treat all your employees fairly. Working Woman, 16, 45-51.
- Fine, M. G., Johnson, F. L., & Ryan, M. S. (1990). Cultural diversity in the workplace. Public Personnel Management, 19, 305-319.
- Galen, M., & Palmer, A. T. (1994, January). White, male, and worried. BusinessWeek, pp. 50-55.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Jones, R. T. (1988). The year 2000 worker. Association Management, 40, 14-16.
- Kleiman, C. (1991, October/November). The challenge of a diverse work force. High Technology Careers Magazine, p.22.
- Kleiman, C. (1992, April 19). Few firms have broken "glass ceiling". San Jose Mercury News, p. 1.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (1992). Organizational behavior (2nd ed.). Boston: Irwin.
- Livingston, A. (1991). 12 companies that do the right thing. Working Woman, 16, 57-60.
- Mowen, J. C. (1987). Consumer behavior. New York: Macmillan.
- Nhu, T. T. (1992, April 26). Asian heritage can be an asset in business. San Jose Mercury News, p. 2L.

- Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scimens, L. (Producer), & Pederson, R. (Director). (1992). Marketplace (Television). KGO-TV, Inc.
- Sessa, V. I. (1992). Managing diversity at the Xerox corporation: Balanced workforce goals and caucus groups. In S. E. Jackson & Associates (Ed.), Diversity in the workplace (pp. 37-64). New York: Guilford.
- Thornburg, L. (1991, August). What's wrong with Workforce 2000? HRMagazine, pp. 38-42.
- Weckler, D. A. (1991, April). High commitment organizations and the work force of the future: Meeting the challenges of demographic diversity. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Wexley, K. N., & Latham, G. P. (1991). Developing and training human resources in organizations. New York: HarperCollins.
- Williams, M. (1990). Managing workplace diversity...the wave of the '90s. Communication World, 7, 16-19.
- Wong, H. Z. (1991, October/November). Work force diversity: The competitive advantage of managing diversity in the workplace. High Technology Careers Magazine, pp. 14, 21.

School of Social Sciences • *Department of Psychology*
One Washington Square • San José, California 95192-0120 • 408/924-5600 • FAX 408/924-5605

Dear Participant:

My name is Nigel Lor and I am a graduate student at San Jose State University. I am conducting a research study to investigate how organizations in the Silicon Valley are managing diversity in their work force. The results of this study should provide valuable information as to the progress organizations have made in this culturally diverse region. I would greatly appreciate if you could spend the next few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire, which deals with the issue in question, and return the form to me in the self-addressed envelope.

You should understand that your participation is voluntary and that choosing not to participate in this study will not affect your relations with San Jose State University. Although the results of this study may be published, your responses will remain completely anonymous and none of the information you provide will ever be linked to you.

If you have any questions concerning the study, you may contact me at (408)248-7083 or Howard Tokunaga, Ph.D., at (408)924-5649. If you have questions or complaints about research participant's rights, please contact Serena Stanford, Ph.D., Associate Academic Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, at (408)924-2480.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Nigel Lor
San Jose State University

Diversity in the Workplace

The purpose of this survey is to determine how organizations in the Silicon Valley are managing diversity in the work force. Please spend the next few minutes to answer the following questions as truthfully and accurately as possible. All answers will be kept **anonymous**.

1. Based on your perception of your company, what percentage of **promotions** into supervisory positions has been given to:
_____ % Males
_____ % Females
(the percentages should add up to 100)
2. Based on your perception of your company, what percentage of **promotions** into supervisory positions has been given to:
_____ % Minorities
_____ % Non-minorities
3. Based on your perception of your company, what percentage of **hiring** into supervisory positions has been given to:
_____ % Males
_____ % Females
4. Based on your perception of your company, what percentage of **hiring** into supervisory positions has been given to:
_____ % Minorities
_____ % Non-minorities
5. How would you rate your company's record in promoting **minorities** into managerial positions?
_____ Extremely poor _____ Poor _____ Adequate _____ Good _____ Excellent
6. How would you rate your company's record in promoting **women** into managerial positions?
_____ Extremely poor _____ Poor _____ Adequate _____ Good _____ Excellent
7. How would you rate your company's record in promoting **white males** into managerial positions?
_____ Extremely poor _____ Poor _____ Adequate _____ Good _____ Excellent
8. Do you believe that affirmative action or equal employment opportunity programs lead to hiring less qualified employees?
_____ Never _____ Sometimes _____ Often _____ Always _____ Don't know
9. The hiring and promotion of **women** and **minorities** should be: (check one)
_____ Based on the distribution of women and minorities in the general population
_____ Based on the distribution of women and minorities in the fields in which hiring is taking place
_____ Based on the goal of hiring as many women and minorities as possible
_____ Based on the qualifications alone with no concern for affirmative action goals
10. How would you rate your company's record in actively recruiting **women**?
_____ Extremely poor _____ Poor _____ Adequate _____ Good _____ Excellent
11. How would you rate your company's record in actively recruiting **minorities**?
_____ Extremely poor _____ Poor _____ Adequate _____ Good _____ Excellent
12. How would you rate your company's record in actively recruiting **white males**?
_____ Extremely poor _____ Poor _____ Adequate _____ Good _____ Excellent

Appendix A

39

13. Do you think that affirmative action and equal employment opportunity programs promote reverse discrimination (discrimination against white males)?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Seldom ☐ Never

14. I prefer to work with _____. (choose one)

☐ men ☐ women ☐ both men and women

15. I prefer to be supervised by _____. (choose one)

☐ men ☐ women ☐ both men and women

16. I prefer to work with _____. (choose one)

☐ members of my own race ☐ members of another race ☐ members of any race

17. I prefer to be supervised by _____. (choose one)

☐ members of my own race ☐ members of another race ☐ members of any race

18. Have you ever witnessed any form of sexual harassment while working at your company?

☐ Never ☐ One time ☐ two to four times ☐ more than four times

19. How serious a problem do you think sexual harassment is in your company?

☐ Not at all serious ☐ Somewhat serious ☐ Serious ☐ Extremely serious

20. How would you describe your company's commitment to your training and development?

☐ Not at all committed ☐ Superficially committed ☐ Genuinely committed

21. To become a manager in your company, you must: (check all that apply)

☐ have at least a Bachelor's degree

☐ work hard

☐ be able to perform at the managerial level

☐ have "friends in the right places"

☐ be an Affirmative Action candidate

☐ have seniority

☐ be a team player

☐ other _____

22. What unique obstacles to promotion do you feel **women** face in your organization? (check all that apply)

☐ White male culture/network

☐ Stereotyping

☐ Maternal and family duties

☐ Lack of mentoring programs

☐ Other _____

☐ Women do not face unique obstacles to promotion

23. What unique obstacles to promotion do you feel **minorities** face in your organization? (check all that apply)

☐ White male culture/network

☐ Stereotyping

☐ Lack of mentoring programs

☐ Other _____

☐ Minorities do not face unique obstacles to promotion

24. What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female

25. What is your age? _____

26. How would you identify yourself ethnically?

- ☐ White
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Hispanic
- ☐ American Indian
- ☐ Other, please specify: _____

27. What is your annual salary? (before taxes)

- ☐ \$20,000 or less
- ☐ \$20,001 - \$30,000
- ☐ \$30,001 - \$40,000
- ☐ \$40,001 - \$50,000
- ☐ \$50,001 - \$60,000
- ☐ over \$60,000

28. In the code of Federal Regulations a handicapped person is defined as any person who (1) has a physical or mental impairment* which substantially impairs one or more major life activities (for example, walking, hearing, learning, working, performing manual tasks); (2) has a record of such an impairment; or (3) is regarded as having such an impairment. Are you a handicapped person?

- ☐ Yes, I am. I have told my employer about my condition.
- ☐ Yes, I am. I have not told my employer about my condition.
- ☐ No, I am not a handicapped person.

* Handicapping conditions include but are not limited to alcoholism, blindness, deafness, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, mental or emotional illness, orthopedic impairments, learning disabilities, and speech impairments.

29. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- ☐ Some high school
- ☐ High school graduate
- ☐ Some college
- ☐ 2-year college degree
- ☐ 4-year college degree
- ☐ Some graduate school
- ☐ Graduate degree

30. How would you classify your organization? (choose one)

- ☐ Construction
- ☐ Manufacturing
- ☐ Wholesale and Retail Trades
- ☐ Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate
- ☐ Services
- ☐ Public Administration

31. What position do you hold in this organization? _____

32. How long have you been working at your current organization? _____ Years _____ Months

33. Are you a full-time or part-time worker?

- ☐ Full-time (35 or more hours a week) ☐ Part-time (less than 35 hours a week)

34. Does your organization have any workshops or programs that address the issue of valuing diversity in the workplace? (check all that apply)
- ☐ Lectures
 - ☐ Videotapes/Films
 - ☐ Role Plays/Simulations
 - ☐ Other _____
 - ☐ My organization does not have workshops that address work force diversity.
35. If your organization does have programs or workshops in valuing diversity in the workplace, what is their duration?
- ☐ Half a day
 - ☐ One day
 - ☐ Two days
 - ☐ Three or more days
 - ☐ Not applicable
36. What are the percentages of men and women working in your organization?
- ☐ % Males
 - ☐ % Females
37. What are the percentages of minorities and non-minorities working in your organization?
- ☐ % Minorities
 - ☐ % Non-minorities

THANK YOU

Office of the Academic Vice President • Associate Academic Vice President • Graduate Studies and Research
One Washington Square • San Jose, California 95192-0025 • 408/924-2480

To: Nigel Lor
121 Saratoga Ave., Apt. 4113
Santa Clara, CA 95051

From: Serena W. Stanford
AAVP, Graduate Studies and Research

Date: November 3, 1992

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"Cultural Diversity in the Workplace"

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to any and all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Dr. Serena Stanford immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that each subject needs to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate or withdrawal will not affect any services the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted.

If you have questions, please contact me at 408-924-2480.

CC: John Jacobs, SJSU Psychology Subject Pool Coordinator
Howard Tokunaga