

2010

Diversity Backlash: Examining the Caucasian Response in Homogenous and Heterogeneous Groups

Michael Dooney
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dooney, Michael, "Diversity Backlash: Examining the Caucasian Response in Homogenous and Heterogeneous Groups" (2010).
Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs). 603.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/603>

**Diversity Backlash:
Examining the Caucasian Response in Homogenous and Heterogeneous Groups**

By Michael Dooney

Thesis Advisor: Monsignor Dennis Mahon, Ph.D.

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts in Strategic Communication
Seton Hall University
South Orange, NJ
2010**

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between Caucasian workers and diversity management programs in the workplace. More specifically, this study analyzes the variations in this relationship that occur depending on the degree that diversity initiatives have affected a worker's particular department. The method used for this study is a pair of scenario surveys that measure differences in Caucasian attitudes and behaviors due to the aforementioned variable. In one scenario, a worker's department has been directly affected by diversity initiatives. In the other scenario, a worker's department remains unaffected by diversity initiatives while surrounding departments have been affected. The results indicate that this variable has little impact on the Caucasian response to, and perception of, systematic increases in workplace diversity.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	5
Chapter 1: Introduction	7
Background (Diversity Management)	11
Background (Reverse Discrimination)	12
Research Question	16
Purpose/Need for the Study	16
Objectives	17
Definition of Terms	17
Limitations	17
Chapter II: Review of Literature	20
Definition of Diversity Management	20
Purpose of Diversity Management	24
Inherent Problems and Reverse Discrimination	27
Chapter III: Methodology	33
Chapter IV: Results	37
General Results	37
Gender Analysis	41
Job Type Analysis	47
Age Range Analysis	55
Education Level Analysis	62

Chapter V: Conclusions & Recommendations	68
Conclusions	68
Recommendations	72
References	78
Appendix A: Labor Statistics Data	82
Appendix B: Surveys	90
Appendix C: Raw Survey Results	98
Appendix D: Individual Responses	105

List of Tables

Table 1: Field Test Results	34
Table 2: Total Results	37
Table 3.1: Complete Results by Gender	40
Table 3.2: Complete Results by Gender (Averages)	42
Table 3.3: Single Gender Averages Comparisons	42
Table 3.4: Average Comparisons Between Genders	44
Table 3.5: Total Average Comparison for Gender	45
Table 4.1: Survey A1 Job Type Comparison	46
Table 4.2: Survey A2 Job Type Comparison	47
Table 4.3: Survey A1 Job Type Comparison (Averages)	49
Table 4.4: Survey A2 Job Type Comparison (Averages)	50
Table 4.5: Average Comparisons Between Job Types	51
Table 5.1: Survey A1 Age Range Comparison	55
Table 5.2: Survey A2 Age Range Comparison	56
Table 5.3: Survey A1 Age Range Comparison (Averages)	57
Table 5.4: Survey A2 Age Range Comparison (Averages)	58
Table 5.5: Average Comparisons Between Age Ranges	59
Table 6.1: Survey A1 Education Level Comparison	62
Table 6.2: Survey A2 Education Level Comparison	62

Table 6.3: Survey A1 Education Level Comparison (Averages)	63
Table 6.4: Survey A2 Education Level Comparison (Averages)	64
Table 6.5: Bachelor's Degree Comparison (Averages)	64
Table 6.6: Master's Degree Comparison (Averages)	65
Table 6.7: Average Comparisons Between Education Levels	66
Table 7: Question #15 Data Summary (Averages)	69

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The successful implementation of diversity management programs in the United States is one of the key issues currently facing American companies, and the importance of such programs will only increase in the future. One need only examine recent labor statistics to understand why diversity is one of the most important topics in the corporate world and related scholarship. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the percentage of minority (non-white) employees in the workforce has increased 2.9% in the last ten years. Of all the minority groups, Hispanics have seen the largest increase in employment, going from 9.3% of the workforce in July, 1999 to 12.6% in July, 2009. Conversely, Caucasians are the only group which has experienced a percentage decrease in the last five years, dropping by .008% to represent 73.4% of the workforce in July, 2009 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009).

Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics also shows that women have seen a similarly increased presence in the workplace in the last decade. Women now account for 44.2% of white workers (up from 42.3% in July, 1999), 52.5% of black workers (up from 50.7%) and 38% of Hispanic workers (up from 37.8%)

Statistics imply that these trends will continue as the percentage of white workers dwindles and the workplace becomes increasingly diversified. Since Caucasians are the only group to experience consistent decreases in workplace representation, effective diversity management has become an increasingly vital component of corporate strategies. See Appendix A for employment data for the last decade.

In addition to the statistical justification for an increased managerial focus on diversity, the legal effects of poor diversity management can be dire. If an employee feels

that he/she has been discriminated against, he/she can sue the employer and, even if the case doesn't have merit, "companies often feel compelled to settle because the cost of litigation is so high" (Johnson & Indvick, 2000, p.170). The resulting diversity-related cases can cost companies tens of millions of dollars, not to mention the potential for a public relations nightmare. Consequently, the legal system has made diversity management an indispensable element of any corporate strategy.

The litigious aspects of diversity management and discrimination have become considerably more complicated in recent years as the focus has largely shifted from overt racism to cases of complex and subtle racism (Banks & Ford, 2009). Complex racism refers to cases in which an individual claims that they were discriminated against for multiple reasons. For instance, an elderly black man could claim discrimination on the basis of both age and race. "Over the years, the EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) has received an increasing number of race and color discrimination charges that allege multiple or intersecting prohibited biases such as age, disability, gender, national origin and religion" (Kotkin, 2009, p.1).

Subtle racism (also known as subtle bias, unconscious bias and implicit bias) poses a particularly complex problem for employers and lawmakers. Subtle racism occurs when "people are treating each other differently even when they are unaware that they are doing so" (Jolls & Sunstein, 2006, p.969). Much recent literature has been devoted to this particular type of racism as scholars have explored its implications in medicine (Green et al., 2007), law (Glenn, 2008) and science (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006). However, the role of subtle racism in the corporate world, particularly in the context of diversity-related business strategies, remains largely unexplored.

Aside from the potential legal consequences of mishandling diversity-related issues, improper management of workplace diversity can place a company at a distinct competitive disadvantage in a market with frequently shifting demographics (Arai, Wanca-Thibault, & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). Diversity management “is a strategic decision, based on its positive impact on the organization’s bottom line” (Hon & Brunner, 2000, p. 311). The basic argument in favor of diversity management’s financial benefits is that an “organization is most effective when it is diverse enough to deal with and capitalize on the diversity in its external environment” (Hon & Brunner, 2000, p. 313). In other words, a company will be more successful if its employees are demographically representative of the publics that the company seeks to serve. This diversification will only become more vital in the near future, as “expectations for the next decade predict women and people of color will fill 75% of the 20+ million new jobs created in the United States” (Arai et al., p. 445).

Diversity management can have positive effects on employees on an individual level, which can turn into larger benefits for the company as a whole. Specifically, diversity management can help employees in the areas of resource availability and group dynamics.

Starting with resource availability, an employee’s perceived access to workplace resources has a direct impact on his/her efficiency and job satisfaction (Gilbert, 2000a). “Additionally, racial minorities perceived that fewer resources were available to them at work” (Gilbert, 2000a, p.175). It logically follows that, if minorities feel that they have limited resource availability, they will not be satisfied with their jobs and the company’s turnover rate will be adversely affected. Diversity management, if properly utilized, will

enable a company to avoid such situations by ensuring that minority workers don't have these concerns.

On the subject of the company's workforce dynamic, successful use of diversity management can enable minority and majority workers to combine as a more cohesive, and more effective, unit. The incorporation of a variety of ethnicities and races into a single workgroup enables such a group to consider a broader range of solutions to corporate problems because "there is ample evidence that individuals from different cultures interpret situations and concepts very differently from one another" (Beebe & Masterson, 1994, p.66). Therefore, diversity will theoretically result in higher quality work, enhanced decision-making and increased synergy because employees will consider a greater range of ideas and solutions (Knouse & Dansby, 1999). Diversity management has been shown to accelerate the creation of such effective heterogeneous workgroups by showing employees the benefits of diversity (Milliken & Martins, 1996; Hopkins & Hopkins, 2002).

Although diversity management has several benefits, research has also shown that it could potentially alienate white workers and lead to concerns about reverse discrimination. "Reverse discrimination refers to preferential treatment of certain groups so as to improve their chances of access to opportunity as part-compensation for historic exclusion and neglect" (Keller, 1976). In other words, it's perceived as discrimination against white people for the benefit of minorities. Reverse discrimination and other negative aspects of diversity management will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

In summation, well-handled, thoughtful and thorough diversity management can be highly beneficial to organizations in a variety of legal and empirical ways on both the corporate and individual levels. However, it also poses the threat of angering white workers and generating claims of reverse discrimination. Accordingly, the thorough study of the benefits, implications and limitations of diversity management is of paramount importance to both the future of American corporations and diversity-related scholarship.

Background

Diversity management

Diversity management has existed, on some level, in America since the 1960s. However, the justification and purpose of such programs has changed over time. Dr. Billy E. Vaughn, Ph.D. has written extensively about the historical origins and metamorphoses of diversity management. In order to clarify the meaning and purpose of diversity management, some of Dr. Vaughn's findings in the article "History of Diversity Management" will now be summarized.

Diversity management began in the 1960s with a focus on education. In the wake of the civil rights movement, it became clear that white workers and minority workers would have to learn to work together to become successful in a newly integrated corporate world. Furthermore, the emergence of diversity management was a "reaction to the...violent demonstrations by activists determined to send a clear message to Americans of European descent that black people would no longer remain voiceless regarding their treatment as citizens. Social change in order to achieve a more stable society prevailed was the rationale for the education, which primarily focused on training to increase sensitivity towards and awareness of racial differences" (Vaughn, n.d.).

While the initial focus of diversity management was almost entirely on race, this gradually expanded to other groups. In the 1970s, such diversity initiatives began integrating gender training and sensitivity into their overall goals and methods. In the 1990s, this expanded to include a wide range of minority groups based on religion, country of origin and sexual orientation (Vaughn, n.d.).

Over the years, the focus of diversity management has shifted from education to utilization. Initially, the primary justification for such programs was to avoid law suits stemming from claims of racial discrimination. However, in the last decade the litigious argument for such programs has taken a back seat to claims that diversity can provide more immediate and measurable benefits. "Many organizations now assume that diversity education can boost productivity and innovation in an increasingly diverse work environment" (Vaughn, n.d.). To put it another way, the perceived need for diversity management has gone from defensive (protecting against lawsuits) to offensive (increasing the efficiency of the workforce). Of course, such programs do still serve as valuable legal protection, but most scholars seem to agree that this is no longer the primary focus or purpose.

Reverse discrimination

Reverse discrimination is one of the most interesting and controversial issues currently facing both managers and lawmakers. Burstein summarized reverse discrimination quite succinctly as "discrimination against white men" (p.511). Such discrimination is clearly prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which includes the following passage:

"It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to fail or

refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex or national origin.”

Although the Civil Rights Act was clearly written for the protection of minorities, its language prohibits discrimination against any race, including whites. It didn't take long for white people to start taking employers to court, claiming that they had been discriminated against in favor of minority workers.

The first major legal test of reverse discrimination came in 1978 with the case of *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*. Allan Bakke, a white male, twice applied to the Medical School of the University of California at Davis and was rejected both times. The university had a policy (rooted in affirmative action legislation) that reserved places in each entering class for minority students. The credentials of the minority students seeking these spots were not compared to other students and didn't have to meet the academic standards of the university. These students were granted admission instead of Bakke despite having inferior test scores and academic qualifications. Bakke sued the school claiming reverse discrimination (Posner, 79).

The outcome of the case was mixed and inconclusive. Bakke won the trial and Justice Lewis Powell stated that “racial preferences in favor of minorities were constitutionally equivalent to discrimination against them and required the same judicial scrutiny” (Jeffries, 2003, p.1). However, the court didn't ban race as a factor in hiring and admissions practices. The court would only declare that race could only be one of several deciding factors and not the sole factor (Jeffries, 2003).

The following year, in 1979, reverse discrimination was again tested in the courts with the case of *United Steelworkers of America v. Weber*. Rossum (1985) points to *United Steelworkers of America v. Weber* as being a pivotal reverse discrimination case and “perhaps the most blatant example...of how the Court’s activism continues to impede Congress’s efforts to achieve racial justice” (p. 789). As a brief summary of the case, Brian Weber (a white male) sued because of the company’s policy of having racial preferences in the allotment of on-the-job training opportunities. Weber was “refused admission to three different training programs while blacks having less seniority than Weber were admitted (Rossum, 1985, p.789).

Despite the apparent violation of the Civil Rights Act and disregard for the outcome of *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, the court upheld the company’s right to retain such a policy. The legality of this decision arose from the court’s interpretation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Although the entirety of Title VII is far too lengthy to be included here, it essentially states that “employers may now use affirmative action to remedy a manifest imbalance in their work forces so long as the plan meets some general standards of reasonableness” (Farber, 1994). Stated more simply, reverse discrimination is an acceptable byproduct of affirmative action if it helps diversify an overwhelmingly non-diverse work environment.

Although the results of the Bakke case were mixed and *United Steelworkers of America v. Weber* seemed to set a precedent in favor of allowing employers to engage in reverse discrimination, most cases since then have ruled reverse discrimination to be unconstitutional. Lerner and Nagai (2000) concisely summarized a several significant reverse discrimination cases as follows:

In *Podberesky v. Kirwan* (1995), the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that a blacks-only state-funded scholarship program for college students was illegal. In *Hopwood v. University of Texas* (1996), race preferences in the form of separate admissions pools based on different admissions criteria for underrepresented minorities and whites in law school admissions were ruled illegal. In *Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education* (1986), the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional racial preferences through the forced layoffs of white teachers with greater seniority in favor of minority teachers with less seniority. Two Supreme Court cases arose in the past decade, throwing into doubt many federal and state contracts set aside for minorities. In *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.* (1989), the Supreme Court declared that strict constitutional scrutiny would be applied to race-based classifications by the state government. In *Adarand Constructors Inc. v. Peña* (1995), the same was applied to the federal government.”

The issue of reverse discrimination received national attention in 2009 when white firefighters in New Haven, Connecticut sued the city citing reverse discrimination in its promotion of employees. The lawsuit arose from a 2003 exam given to the firefighters to determine promotions to the rank of lieutenant and captain. “When the city determined that no African-American candidates qualified for a promotion it threw out the results. White and Hispanic firefighters who did qualify called it illegal discrimination and filed a lawsuit” (Richey, 2009, p.1). Ironically, the city threw out the test results because it was trying to avoid accusations of racial discrimination. “New Haven officials said they were worried that if they relied on the results of the test and promoted the white firefighters, the city might be vulnerable to a lawsuit by black firefighters claiming that the test

caused an illegal "disparate impact" against minority job candidates" (Richey, 2009, p.1). The Supreme Court agreed with the white firefighters with a 5-4 decision.

Of course, these cases merely represent a brief selection of the legal history of reverse discrimination. A detailed examination of that history is beyond the scope of this paper, but it's important to establish that reverse discrimination is considered unconstitutional (the outcome of *United Steelworkers of America v. Weber* and the limitations of the Bakke outcome notwithstanding). Therefore, all diversity management programs need to be designed to avoid charges of reverse discrimination.

Research Question

Is white backlash toward diversity initiatives in an organization more likely to manifest itself in heterogeneous versus homogeneous work groups (e.g., greater group conflict, less cohesiveness)? Note: This research question was first proposed by Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman (2004) as a suggestion for future research in this field.

Purpose/Need for the Study

As already discussed, diversity management has played an increasingly pivotal role in the business world. At the same time, reverse discrimination and white backlash toward diversity programs have emerged as key problems for employers. As employers struggle to reconcile these two issues, proper research can help determine how white workers can effectively participate in diversity-related work initiatives without feelings of alienation and bitterness. This study aims to contribute valuable insight toward answering this question.

Objectives

This study has two objectives. First, to add to the body of knowledge on the relationship between diversity management and reverse discrimination. Second, to determine what aspects of diversity management should be avoided in order to prevent feelings of discrimination among white workers.

Definition of terms

1. Diversity Management: "The systematic and planned commitment by organizations to recruit, retain, reward and promote a heterogeneous mix of employees" (Gilbert, 2000, p. 75).
2. Affirmative Action: "A policy of favoring qualified women and minority candidates over qualified men or nonminority candidates ..." (Sterba, 2003, p.285).
3. Reverse Discrimination: "Reverse discrimination refers to preferential treatment of certain groups so as to improve their chances of access to opportunity as part-compensation for historic exclusion and neglect" (Keller, 1976).
4. White Backlash: "Resistance against affirmative action policies and other diversity initiatives on the part of whites, and especially white males" (Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman, 2004, p.78).

Limitations

The research of Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman (2004) served as the basis and inspiration for this study. However, unlike the work of those researchers, this study will not examine multiple justifications for diversity initiatives and the resulting differences in the white response. Instead of analyzing two such justifications (affirmative action and increased profit), this study's surveys only include the increased-

profit justification. Consequently, while the goal of this study is to examine differences in white backlash in homogenous and heterogeneous groups, the potential effects of the affirmative action justification in such scenarios has been left unexplored.

Furthermore, this study is lenient in its definition of the term “homogeneous work group.” The two scenarios both begin with work groups that are 80% white, and then one group drops to 50% while the other group remains unchanged. For the purposes of this study, the group that drops to 50% is considered heterogeneous and the group that remains at 80% is considered homogeneous. Although a homogenous group should technically contain no diversity, the data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics suggests that such work groups are becoming increasingly rare. Therefore, the inclusion of 100% homogeneously white work groups would be fairly unrealistic. The use of 80% white groups allows for groups that are primarily white without creating an improbable lack of diversity.

The use of scenarios is also a limitation of the study. Although scenarios are convenient ways of condensing complex situations and assuring that the respondents are basing their answers on the same information, they are still not necessarily a reflection of real-life situations. The respondents have indicated how they think they would act in the given scenarios, but they might act significantly differently if actually faced with the same circumstances. Therefore, the results are largely hypothetical.

Lastly, the use of Zoomerang to distribute the surveys is a limitation. While online survey services are useful research tools, they also bring a level of uncertainty. Once the surveys were posted, the respondents couldn't be monitored and couldn't supply feedback. Although a field test was conducted that resulted in some minor refinements

and an increased level of confidence in the surveys as viable research tools, it is still unfortunate that the respondents couldn't be monitored more closely. Consequently, it must be assumed that each respondent fully understood the surveys and only responded once (although a motivation for submitting multiple responses is unclear).

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following review of literature discusses diversity management. Specifically, it addresses the definition, purpose and inherent problems of diversity management.

Definition of diversity management

“Diversity” and “diversity management” are terms that evoke strong emotional responses, ranging from ecstatic support to bitter cynicism. Consequently, it is essential that these terms be properly defined before they can be discussed in a broader academic sense. As a general definition, diversity management is concerned with “the integration of minority-group members within a prevailing culture” (Barry & Bateman, 1996, p. 765). However, confusion quickly arises when attempting to create a more specific definition of the term. In this regard, academics have split into two distinctive camps: the diversity-creation camp and the diversity-utilization camp.

As a researcher of the former group, Gilbert (2000b) defined diversity management as “the systematic and planned commitment by organizations to recruit, retain, reward and promote a heterogeneous mix of employees” (p. 75). Echoing Gilbert’s (2000b) sentiments, Bergen, Soper, and Foster (2002) remarked that diversity management initiatives are used by organizations “out of a desire to assure that no person or group is discriminated against” (p. 239).

In contrast, other researchers have defined diversity management not in terms of creating a diverse environment, but in terms of how a diverse environment can be harnessed to create a more efficient and comfortable workplace. In other words, diversity management is not simply a way for organizations to meet moral and legal standards. Rather, it is a strategic tool that, when used effectively, will have a positive affect on an

organization's financial status (Hon & Brunner, 2000). As cited by Hon and Brunner (2000), the Society for Human Resources Management agreed with this definition by stating that diversity management refers to using "an organization's culture and systems to ensure that all people are given the opportunity to contribute to the business goals of the company" (p. 311). Further supporting this definition, Larkey (1996) remarked that "there is speculation on how diversity may have an impact on the bottom line in organizations" (p. 463).

Both of these definitions, meaning both the diversity-creation and diversity-utilization conceptions, have problems. The diversity creation-conception creates confusion by blurring the line between affirmative action and diversity management. Repeated for the sake of comparison, Gilbert (2000) defined diversity management as "the systematic and planned commitment by organizations to recruit, retain, reward and promote a heterogeneous mix of employees" (p. 75). Comparatively, Ledvinka stated that affirmative action has four components: recruitment of under represented groups, changing management attitudes, removing discriminatory obstacles and preferential treatment for under represented groups (as cited by Robinson, Paolillo & Reithel, 1995). Clearly, there is overlap between the two definitions. In fact, other researchers have expressed displeasure with this overlap. Bergen et al. (2002) noted that diversity is not "simply another name for affirmative action" (p. 239). Further separating diversity management and affirmative action, Arai et al. (2001) speculated that "diversity is no longer simply a matter of complying with government mandates" (p. 446).

Philosophical differences aside, there are concrete legal limitations to the diversity-creation conception. More specifically, affirmative action is rooted in legislation. By

equating diversity management with affirmative action, the limitations of these legislative roots are extended to diversity management initiatives. Although a detailed examination of the legal history, definition and limitations of affirmative action is a subject worthy of several volumes of research, a brief summary is necessary to understand the potential pitfalls of equating it with diversity management. Basically, organizations “are governed by two standards in the design and application of voluntary remedial affirmative action plans: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (as amended) and the equal protection provisions of the constitution” (Gullet, 2000, p. 107). Robinson et al. (1995) effectively condensed this legislation into a two-part test that diversity programs must pass: “the race-based program must be justified by a compelling government interest and such action must be narrowly tailored to accomplish that end” (p. 351). Further limiting such programs, affirmative action can only be implemented in response to a particular organization’s past record of discrimination, not because of any quantifiable incentives inherent in diversity (Gulett, 2000b). In summary, by equating diversity management programs with affirmative action, it is implied that the programs must meet the following criteria: they must be designed to meet a specific identifiable goal, they must be disbanded once that goal is reached and they can only be initiated if the organization has a history of ignoring diversity. Such a definition is, therefore, quite limiting.

Aside from the legal limitations of associating diversity management and affirmative action, there has been a scholarly movement away from examining diversity-related issues in relation to affirmative action (Farber, 1994). As “both national politics and the federal judiciary have been inhospitable to efforts to promote African American interests through remedies such as affirmative action” (Farber, 1994, p.902) many diversity

scholars have shifted to a different strategy known as Critical Race Theory (CRT). Although CRT has become a popular topic among academics, the relevant literature lacks a clear and consistent definition for it. In general, CRT seeks to avoid the limitations of discussing diversity in legal terms and “seeks to analyze, deconstruct and transform for the better the relationship among race, racism and power” (Abrams and Moio, 2009, p.250). Since CRT is of only peripheral importance to the goals of this paper, a more concrete definition is not particularly necessary. However, the emergence of CRT implies that the scholarly significance of affirmative action is declining. Consequently, the association of affirmative action with diversity management is limiting both legally and academically.

While the diversity-creation conception is problematic, the diversity utilization-conception is plagued by a division among its supporters. This schism stems from a dispute over the “normative view that any diversity leads to positive consequences” (Pitts, 2003, p. 1). In other words, some researchers simply assume that the utilization of diversity will lead to positive consequences while others insist that such claims be supplemented by quantitative research (Pitts, 2003). The majority of available research is of the non-empirical variety. This has resulted in “a chilling of interest among researchers and administrators in the subject” (Gilbert, 2000b, p. 76).

Taking all of this research into account, an empirical approach to the diversity-utilization conception seems to be the favored approach to the definition and study of diversity management. The diversity creation-approach is too limiting and a non-empirical approach leads to a decreased interest in the subject (Gilbert, 2000b).

Purpose of diversity management

With an empirical approach to the diversity-utilization conception in mind, the purpose of diversity management must now be examined. The literature indicates that there are three primary purposes for the use of diversity management: legal protection, the requisite variety theory and the creation of more effective employee environments.

The legal concerns are, on one hand, the most basic justification for the implementation of diversity management. On the other hand, the legality of diversity is convoluted and must account for accusations of both discrimination and reverse discrimination (meaning accusations of discrimination against the majority group). In order for a corporation to officially and intentionally take measures to create diversity, those measures must “be narrowly tailored to achieve that end in order to reduce the effects that such preference would have on nonpreferred group members” (Robinson et al., 1995, p. 353). To state that more simply, an organization can only create diversity if that organization has a past history of discrimination.

Such guidelines are far from conclusive, however, and lawsuits often result. Consequently, companies are frequently taken to court over charges of racial discrimination, even when there is “no clear-cut evidence that the company discriminated” (Johnson & Indvik, 2000, p. 170). Such trials cost organizations significant amounts of money. According to Johnson and Indvik (2000), “the average cost to take a case to the eve of trial is \$70,000. Once in trial, that amount reaches six figures” (p. 170).

Obviously, it is in the best interests of organizations to avoid these situations. Diversity *management* offers a potential solution to these lawsuits by increasing

communication between majority and minority workers. Unlike affirmative action, which merely forces diversity with little regard to the aftereffects, diversity management “entails recognizing, being open to, and utilizing human differences. The goal is to create a positive work environment for all employees” (Bergen et al., 2002, p. 239). Therefore, if used in the manner outlined by Bergen et al. (2002), diversity management will enable organizations to avoid lawsuits and save copious amounts of money.

Moving from the legal to the theoretical, diversity management is directly linked to Weick’s (1979) concept of requisite variety (as cited by Hon & Brunner, 2000). “The idea is simple: Organizational effectiveness is maximized when internal variability keeps pace with external variability” (Hon & Brunner, 2000, p. 313). Stated even more simply, a company’s workforce should reflect the population if it intends to effectively serve that population. This is especially important now, as noted by Hopkins and Hopkins (2002), because “groups in organizations around the world are experiencing changes in the cultural composition of their membership, and the trend is toward even more change as countries continue to undergo changes in the cultural composition of their general populations” (p. 541). As a result of such changes, “by the year 2010 white men are expected to account for less than 40% of the total American workforce” (Arai et al., 2001, p. 445). The previously discussed data from the U.S. Census Bureau seems to support this data, with whites representing 73.4% of the workforce in July, 2009 with nearly half of that number being female. Kotcher (1996) commented that these population changes represent a major business opportunity, and proper diversity management programs are essential in effectively handling these demographic metamorphoses (as cited by Hon & Brunner, 2000). Stated with more urgency, Naisbitt

and Aburdene claimed that “the advantage for the American industry in the world market will be based upon our success in optimizing and utilizing this richly diverse workforce” (as cited by Gilbert, 2000b).

The use of diversity management to create more effective employee environments can be divided into two sub-categories: positive group dynamics and resource availability. First addressing the issue of group dynamics, it has been theorized that homogeneous work groups prevent employees from understanding diverse demographics and “the diversity climate is underdeveloped because little consideration is given to issues of diversity” (Larkey, 1996, p.469). Furthermore, “some research suggests that more diverse groups have the potential to consider a greater range of perspectives and to generate more high quality solutions than less diverse groups” (Milliken & Martins, 1996, p. 403). Scott E. Page, a professor at the University of Michigan, similarly concluded that the best, most creative solutions are achieved by diverse people working together rather than lone thinkers, even if those individuals have very high IQs” (Tamburri, 2009, p.B8). Diversity management accelerates the process of creating productive heterogeneous workgroups by creating formal socialization processes for majority and minority group members (Hopkins & Hopkins, 2002).

With regard to resource availability, analysis has “showed that perceived resource availability was positively associated with outcomes of empowerment and work group integration. Additionally, racial minorities perceived that fewer resources were available to them at work” (Gilbert, 2000a, p.175). Gilbert (2000a) theorized that a lack of diversity management has resulted in this perceived lack of resources and that this perception can result in dire financial consequences for organizations. Specifically, these

circumstances can lead to decreased employee retention, decreased employee productivity and significant organizational costs caused by frequent turnover. Diversity management can be used to eliminate the perceived lack of resources among minorities and, in turn, eliminate the problems associated with this perception.

Inherent problems and reverse discrimination

While diversity management can be used to solve a number of organizational problems, it also brings with it several potential pitfalls. According to the literature (Larkey, 1996; Hopkins & Hopkins, 2002; Baron & Neuman, 1996; Nemetz & Christensen, 1996; Gullett, 2000; Bergen et al., 2002), the problems with diversity management include negative group dynamics, increased workplace aggression, improper training techniques and the risk of reverse discrimination.

As previously mentioned, diversity management can have a positive effect on employees and enable employees to conceive better and more diverse solutions to organizational problems (Milliken & Martins, 1996). However, not all research supports this idea. While increased diversity may lead to increased creativity, homogeneous work groups are likely to be resistant to these changes (Larkey, 1996). Therefore, diversity may be difficult to implement and its potential benefits may be unattainable. Even if diversity is successfully created, not all researchers are convinced that the results will be positive. For instance, O'Reilly, Caldwell and Barnett (1989) noted that "the greater the amount of diversity in a group or an organizational subunit, the less integrated the group is likely to be" (as cited by Milliken & Martins, 1996). Hopkins and Hopkins (2002) claimed that the injection of diversity into a previously homogeneous work environment may result in an organizational powder keg. Their research indicated that slight behavioral differences

between minority and majority workers may be blown out of proportion to reinforce stereotypes, resulting in a decrease in workplace cooperation and efficiency.

An interesting concept related to diversity and group dynamics is the psychological minority phenomenon (Davis, 1980). "Whites may feel themselves to be in the minority even when numerically they are in the majority (psychological minority), and similarly, Blacks may experience a sense of being in the majority even when they are not" (Davis, 1980, p.179). Building on this idea, Knouse and Dansby (1999) concluded that the ideal proportion of a minority in a group is 30%. "As the proportion of a minority increases in a work group beyond 30% (50% for women), there is a potential for tension and conflict" (Knouse & Dansby, 1999, p.489). Therefore, the idea that diversity has a positive affect on group efficiency is seems to be true to a certain extent.

Other research has shown that diversity will lead not only to decreased communication, but also to an increase in workplace aggression and violence. Tsui, Egan and O'Reilly (1994) concluded "that the greater the diversity in many different workplaces, the more negative were the employees' attitudes toward their organization and the less interested they were in continuing to work their" (as cited by Baron and Neuman, 1996, p. 164). Building upon this research, Baron and Neuman (1996) theorized that diversity leads to increased levels of anger among employees, which, in turn, eventually leads to violence in the workplace. Confirming these suspicions, Baron and Neuman (1996) came to the conclusion that there is a direct link between diversity and violence in the workplace. The correlation between diversity and violence is likely due, at least in part, to the existence of mutual stereotypes in newly heterogeneous workgroups (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Hopkins & Hopkins, 2002).

Ineffective training techniques also commonly lead to the downfall of diversity management programs. The literature suggests that this breakdown is usually caused by one of the following factors: the tendency of diversity trainers to underestimate the strength of preconceived notions about race or questionable agendas on the part of diversity trainers. Regarding the former, diversity trainers often act as if employees are blank slates with no existing notions about diversity. This is not true. In fact, Hopkins and Hopkins (2002) found that minority workers (regardless of their talent and skill) are unlikely to be accepted by majority workers if those majority workers have not previously experienced workplace diversity and/or if the majority workers have preconceived notions about diversity. Additionally, diversity management programs represent only one informational source for employees, and other influences may contradict and undermine the goals of these programs (Nemetz & Christensen, 1996).

Concerning the agendas of diversity trainers, some argue that some diversity proponents are more concerned with imposing political correctness than celebrating differences of perspective among employees (Hon & Brunner, 2000). Bergen et al. (2002) reached similar conclusions and stated that trainers often use their own psychological values and politics as training templates and are often working in allegiance with special interest groups.

Diversity management has also been frequently associated with accusations of reverse discrimination. Reverse discrimination is based on the argument that majority workers are being discriminated against because diversity programs create unfair advantages for minority workers and present majority workers (i.e. white people) as villains (Gullett, 2000).

Gates (1993) referred to the white reaction, particularly the white male reaction, to workplace diversity as "white male paranoia." He found that white men feel that their social roles are being threatened by the increasing presence of minorities in both the workplace and the media. "White male paranoia isn't old-fashioned white liberal guilt: it's atavistic racial and sexual dread, and it achieves critical mass when a rapidly contracting economy becomes overcrowded. White men used to feel guilty about what they had or what they'd done. Now they're required to feel guilty about what they *are*" (Gates, 1993).

However, there is evidence that these feelings are not merely paranoid fears, but the result of increasingly negative portrayals of whites in diversity programs. Indeed, Nemetz and Christensen (1996) noticed that many employees accuse diversity programs of being mere white-male bashing. Bergen et al. (2002) stated this more bluntly by concluding that "the main culprit is diversity training that focuses solely on white racism or demonizes white males in an effort to pull them down from their perceived pedestals and put them in their proper place" (p.243). Bergen et al. (2002) summarized the problem quite well with the following example:

During a "sensitivity session" at the University of Cincinnati, a female academic was singled out and forced to stand in front of her colleagues as an example of the "privileged white elite." Later in the same session the consultant again asked her to stand proclaiming "We all know who the most beautiful woman in the room is. It's the woman with the three private [school] degrees and the blond hair and the blue eyes." His ridiculing tirade did not stop there. "Let's have her stand up so that everyone can look at her. Look at the pearls she's wearing, her clothes, her shoes." The woman remained in her seat, sobbing (p.245).

Further research has shown that such discrimination can have a negative psychological affect on white employees (and all employees in general). White workers “who reported that they had been discriminated against were found to have poorer mental health outcomes than their same-race counterparts who did not acknowledge being discriminated against” (Roberts, Swanson & Murphy, 2004, p.129). Additionally, white workers “who perceived racial/ethnic discrimination at work reported lower levels of job satisfaction....compared to whites who did not” (Roberts, Swanson & Murphy, 2004, p. 136).

Although research has shown that whites may have adverse reactions to diversity management programs, the white perception of diversity has more to do with the justification for diversity than diversity itself. “Whites may react more negatively to affirmative action programs because they, individually or as a group, stand to “lose”; whereas reactions to diversity management may be less negative or even positive because the company as a whole stands to gain” (Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman, 2004, p.80). The study conducted by Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman (2004) sought to examine the differences in the white response to two justifications for increased workplace diversity: affirmative action (diversity for the sake of diversity) and diversity management (diversity for the sake of increased efficiency and profitability). The results showed that white workers’ negative feelings toward “the diversity program were stronger for an affirmative action justification than a diversity management justification” (Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman, 2004, p.91)

While much of the available literature makes at least a passing reference to the relationship between diversity management and reverse discrimination, the topic is ripe for further research. Studies such as the one by Bergen et al. (2002) examine this relationship in terms of training methods, but very little of the literature looked at the situation from the perspective of those most closely connected to it: white workers. The research of Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman (2004) constitutes one of the rare instances when the literature looked at the issue from this perspective. If diversity management is to be successful the future, and the literature suggests that this success is of the utmost importance for organizations, then this area of study can't be ignored. Therefore, this study will build off the work of the aforementioned researchers and seek to address one of their suggestions for future research: "Is white backlash toward diversity initiatives in an organization more likely to manifest itself in heterogeneous versus homogeneous work groups (e.g., greater group conflict, less cohesiveness)" (Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman, 2004, p.95)?

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This study utilized two scenario surveys, both with a Likert scale to measure responses. The surveys assessed what behaviors and attitudes are likely to manifest among white workers in response to increased workplace diversity. In particular, the surveys sought to identify how these behaviors and attitudes would vary in homogeneous and heterogeneous work groups. See Appendix B for the complete surveys.

Scenario surveys were chosen as the research method for two reasons. First, this study is meant to expand upon the work of Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman (2004). Since their research used scenario surveys, it's only logical that an expansion of that work would use the same method. Second, scenarios allow for the establishment of neutral ground for the respondents. Since each respondent has had unique experiences in their work environment, asking for responses based upon those experiences would introduce a plethora of unwanted variables. The scenarios supplied a controllable and common starting point for each respondent.

The two scenarios varied through the manipulation of the following variable: Whether or not the diversity initiatives have directly affected the respondent. This was presented in two forms. In one scenario (Survey A1), the respondent's department has been directly affected by the initiative and the department's percentage of white workers has dropped from 80% to 50%. In the other scenario (Survey A2), the respondent's department remains unaffected at 80% white while surrounding departments have dropped to 50% white.

The questions addressed three worker characteristics following the implementation of the diversity initiative: attitude and commitment toward the company, attitude toward

minority co-workers and behavioral tendencies in homogeneous and heterogeneous work groups. The different scenarios illustrated how these characteristics would change depending on the variable configuration.

Prior to the distribution of the survey, a field test was conducted to assess potential weaknesses in the wording of the scenarios and questions. The field test had 10 participants with five people responding to each of the two scenarios. The respondents were all white professionals with the following occupations: two secretaries, a marketing manager, a sales manager, a waitress, an assistant manager in a supermarket, a machine operator in a factory, a public relations assistant, the CEO of a food distribution company and a graduate student.

The results were summarized so as to measure the negativity of the respondents for each question. The disagreement scale for the questions was converted to a numeric scale ranging from 1-5, with 1 = highly positive, 3 = neutral and 5 = highly negative. The relationship between a respondent's level of agreement and their level of negativity varied with each question (meaning that, depending on the wording of the question, the response "Strongly Agree" could equate to a negativity ranking of either 1 or 5). Since there are five respondents for each survey, a question with a score of 5 is perfectly positive, a score of 15 is perfectly neutral and a score of 25 is perfectly negative. The results of the field test are summarized in the following table. Please note that the questions on this table, and all subsequent tables, start with #5 because the first four questions pertain to demographic classification.

Table 1
Field Test Results

	Survey A1 (heterogeneous)	Survey A2 (homogenous)	Total
Question 5	18	17	35
Question 6	18	17	35
Question 7	12	12	24
Question 8	21	23	44
Question 9	20	19	39
Question 10	17	16	33
Question 11	12	12	24
Question 12	14	16	30
Question 13	18	21	39
Question 14	13	17	30
Question 15	17	23	40
Question 16	10	13	23
Cov (A1, A2) = 9.78	N (A1) = 5	N (A2) = 5	N (Total) = 10
r (A1,A2) = .8	Σ A1 = 190	Σ A2 = 206	Σ (Total) = 396
t = 0.04	Avg. (A1) = 15.83	Avg. (A2) = 17.17	Avg. (Total) = 33
	s (A1) = 3.51	s (A2) = 3.81	s (Total) = 6.94
	Var (A1) = 12.33	Var (A2) = 14.51	Var (total) = 48.18

The field test data implied that the tested variable (i.e., whether the respondent's work group remained largely homogenous) is unlikely to have a significant impact upon negativity toward increased diversity in the company as a whole. The negativity levels for the two scenarios have a strongly positive relationship (Cov = 9.79, $r = .8$), meaning that respondents' levels of negativity were similar regardless of the variable. Interestingly, the results were slightly more negative among those respondents whose workgroup remained unchanged in the scenario (meaning those that completed the A2 survey, in which the work group remained 80% white). However, the difference was minimal, as the A1 survey had a negativity average of 15.83 and the A2 survey had a negativity average of 17.16. The t-value of the data ($t = .03747277$, alpha level = .05, $df = 8$) indicates that the two data sets aren't significantly different. In short, the affect of the variable was

negligible in the field test. However, the sample population is non-random and largely convenient, so such inferential statistics must be taken with some skepticism.

Following the analysis of the field test, the surveys were distributed via the online survey service Zoomerang in order to acquire the actual data for this study. The surveys were posted online on October 28, 2009 with instructions for only Caucasian respondents to participate. Once a suitable quantity of surveys was completed, the surveys were closed and the results underwent the same statistical analysis as the field test data.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

General Results

The surveys were closed on January 18, 2010 with 100 responses per survey.

The results were analyzed and summarized in the same manner as the results of the field test. Repeated for the sake of clarity, the results were summarized so as to measure the negativity of the respondents for each question. The disagreement scale for the questions was converted to a numeric scale ranging from 1-5, with 1 = highly positive, 3 = neutral and 5 = highly negative. The relationship between a respondent's level of agreement and their level of negativity varied with each question (meaning that, depending on the wording of the question, the response "Strongly Agree" could equate to a negativity ranking of either 1 or 5).

As an example, the fifth question on Survey A1 states the following: "The quality of work in my department is likely to decline." Since a strong level of agreement with this statement signifies a highly negative response to the increased diversity levels, the response "Strongly Agree" is equivalent to a negativity score of 5. Conversely, a response of "Strongly Disagree" is equivalent to a negativity score of 1.

For the duration of this analysis, the two surveys will be referred to by their codenames: Survey A1 and Survey A2. In order to avoid confusion, here are the distinguishing characteristics of the two surveys:

Survey A1: The respondent's department has been directly affected by the diversity initiatives and is now more heterogeneous. The department has gone from 80% white to 50% white.

Survey A2: The respondent's department hasn't been directly affected by the diversity initiatives and remains largely homogenous (80% white). Other departments in the company have been affected and have been reduced to 50% white.

The following table contains the total results of both surveys using the negativity scale. In order to determine a question's maximum negativity score, multiply the total number of participants (N) by five. Since there are 100 responses per survey, the maximum negativity score for each question is 500 (100 x 5). The minimum negativity score for each question is 100 (100 x 1). Similarly, the maximum negativity score for the total of each question (A1 + A2) is 1,000 while the minimum is 200. See Appendix C for the raw survey results.

Table 2
Total Results (Surveys A1 and A2)

	A1 (heterogeneous)	A2 (homogenous)	Total
Question 5	294	287	581
Question 6	257	239	496
Question 7	201	211	412
Question 8	329	325	654
Question 9	279	280	559
Question 10	277	260	537
Question 11	187	180	367
Question 12	243	235	478
Question 13	304	288	592
Question 14	258	230	488
Question 15	282	363	645
Question 16	148	162	310
Cov (A1, A2) = 2435.92	N = 100	N = 100	N = 200
r (A1, A2) = .87	$\Sigma = 3059$	$\Sigma = 3060$	$\Sigma = 6119$
t = .99	Avg. = 254.92	Avg. = 255	Avg. = 509.92
	s = 52.51	s = 57.85	s = 106.86
	Var = 2757.54	Var = 3347.09	Var = 11419.36

The basic purpose of this research (as proposed by the research question) is to determine if white backlash toward diversity initiatives in an organization more likely to manifest itself in heterogeneous versus homogeneous work groups (e.g., greater group

conflict, less cohesiveness) (Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman, 2004). These results suggest that the answer is, quite simply, as follows: No, it doesn't make a difference. The results of the heterogeneous scenario (Survey A1) and the homogenous scenario (Survey A2) are not significantly different. The high level of covariance ($Cov = 2435.92$) and the high value of the correlation coefficient ($r = .87$) indicate that the level of negativity is likely to be similar for each question regardless of the racial composition of the respondent's specific department. The t-value of the data ($t = .99$, alpha level = .05, $df = 198$) further indicates that the two data sets aren't significantly different. The only exception is question #15, as will be discussed.

The descriptive statistics further support these conclusions. The total negativity score for the heterogeneous scenario (A1) is 3,059 while the total score for the homogenous scenario (A2) is 3,060. The average negativity score for Survey A1 is 254.92 while the average score for Survey A2 is 255. Clearly, these statistics indicate that the two data sets are extremely similar.

It is worth noting, however, that the homogenous group does have a larger standard deviation and a higher level of variance among its responses, indicating a greater variety of opinion among those who took Survey A2. This signifies that there is a greater consensus among those respondents whose departments are directly impacted by diversity initiatives. Nevertheless, the differences between the two data sets remain statistically negligible.

In terms of total negativity scores, the highest scoring question is #8. The statement in the eighth question states the following: "The new minority workers benefited from lowered hiring standards." The total negativity score for this statement is 654 (out of

1,000), making it one of two questions with a total score over 600 and more than one standard deviation above the mean. The two response groups are strongly united in their agreement with this statement, with negativity scores of 329 (Survey A1) and 325 (Survey A2).

Question #15 is second in terms of total negativity with a score of 645 (out of 1,000). Along with the aforementioned eighth question, this question has a total score that is more than one standard deviation above the average total negativity score. Due to differences in the scenario, the wording of the statement in this question varies between the two surveys. The difference is as follows:

Survey A1 (employees' department is directly affected by increased diversity): "If given the chance, I will switch to another department."

Survey A2 (employees' department is not directly affected by increased diversity): "If given the chance, I would switch to a department that has been affected by this policy."

In both cases, the negativity level of the respondents is above average. However, unlike the eighth question, there is a significant difference between the two response groups: The Survey A1 respondents have a total negativity score of 282 versus a score of 363 among those responding to Survey A2. This is, by far, the greatest variation in the overall results. In fact, although this question is second in terms of total negativity, it is actually the fourth most negatively received question on Survey A1. On this survey, both question #13 (negativity score = 304) and #5 (negativity score = 294) scored higher than #15. Possible explanations for this will be discussed later.

On the other end of the spectrum, two questions have negativity scores that are more than one standard deviation below the average. The lowest scoring (and, therefore, most positively received) question is #16, which states "I would be more likely to sabotage the

work of a minority worker than that of a white worker.” This statement was met with overwhelming disagreement and has a negativity score of 310. Both individual surveys registered their lowest negativity scores with this question, with scores of 148 and 162 for Survey A1 and Survey A2, respectively.

The second lowest scoring question is #11, which states “I am just as likely to help my minority co-workers as I am my white co-workers.” The vast majority of participants responded positively to this question, resulting in a negativity score of 367. The total scores for the individual surveys are 187 (Survey A1) and 180 (Survey A2).

The remaining eight questions all registered scores within one standard deviation of the average. For these questions, the combined negativity scores for the two surveys range from a moderately positive 412 (question #7: “I will try to become friends with my new minority co-workers”) to a moderately negative 592 (question #13: “When I am with both my white and minority co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy”). The results of the two surveys are similar for all of these questions.

Gender Analysis

The following table displays the total results, using the negativity scale, for the two surveys divided by gender:

Table 3.1
Complete Results by Gender

Totals	A1 Male	A1 Female	A2 Male	A2 Female	Total Male	Total Female
Question 5	163	131	165	122	328	253
Question 6	145	112	137	102	282	214
Question 7	109	92	119	92	228	184

Question 8	176	153	185	140	361	293
Question 9	147	132	158	122	305	254
Question 10	147	130	149	111	296	241
Question 11	101	86	103	77	204	163
Question 12	133	110	136	99	269	209
Question 13	160	144	159	129	319	273
Question 14	143	115	128	102	271	217
Question 15	150	132	199	164	349	296
Question 16	82	66	95	67	177	133
	N = 52	N = 48	N = 54	N = 46	N = 106	N = 94
	$\Sigma = 1656$	$\Sigma = 1403$	$\Sigma = 1733$	$\Sigma = 1327$	$\Sigma = 3389$	$\Sigma = 2730$
	Avg. = 138	Avg. = 116.917	Avg. = 144.417	Avg. = 110.583	Avg. = 282.417	Avg. = 227.5
	s = 27.476	s = 25.414	s = 31.140	s = 26.922	s = 56.611	s = 50.637
	Var = 754.909	Var = 645.901	Var = 969.719	Var = 724.812	Var = 3204.81	Var = 2564.09

The surveys' respondents are not quite evenly split between men and women, with 106 total men participating and 94 women participating. In order to determine the maximum negativity score for any given question, multiply the total number of participants (N) by five. So, for example, the maximum negativity score for any question on Survey A1 for male respondents is 260 (52 x 5).

The divided results for the two genders are consistent with the combined results. As with the overall results, both genders responded most negatively to question #8 (with negativity scores of 363 and 2893 for men and women, respectively) and question #15 (with scores of 349 and 296). Again, it must be noted that question #15 experienced an 81 point jump in negativity between the surveys. Likewise, both genders responded most positively to question #16 (with negativity scores of 177 and 133) and question #11 (with scores of 204 and 163).

Since the respondents aren't evenly split between men and women, it's useful to convert this data into averages in order to make valid comparisons. The following table contains the gender data converted into average scores:

Table 3.2
Complete Results by Gender (Averages)

Averages	A1 Male	A1 Female	A2 Male	A2 Female	Total Male	Total Female
Question 5	3.13	2.73	3.05	2.65	3.09	2.69
Question 6	2.79	2.33	2.54	2.22	2.66	2.28
Question 7	2.1	1.92	2.2	2	2.15	1.96
Question 8	3.38	3.19	3.42	3.04	3.4	3.12
Question 9	2.83	2.75	2.92	2.65	2.88	2.7
Question 10	2.83	2.71	2.76	2.41	2.79	2.56
Question 11	1.94	1.79	1.91	1.67	1.92	1.73
Question 12	2.56	2.29	2.52	2.15	2.54	2.22
Question 13	3.08	3	2.94	2.8	3.01	2.9
Question 14	2.75	2.39	2.37	2.22	2.56	2.31
Question 15	2.88	2.75	3.68	3.56	3.29	3.15
Question 16	1.58	1.37	1.76	1.46	1.67	1.41
	N = 52	N = 48	N = 54	N = 46	N = 106	N = 94
	$\Sigma = 31.85$	$\Sigma = 29.22$	$\Sigma = 32.07$	$\Sigma = 28.83$	$\Sigma = 31.96$	$\Sigma = 29.03$
	Avg. = 2.654	Avg. = 2.43	Avg. = 2.67	Avg. = 2.4	Avg. = 2.66	Avg. = 2.42
	s = .527	s = .53	s = .574	s = .583	S = .533	s = .54
	Var = .277	Var = .282	Var = .33	Var = .34	Var = .284	Var = .291

Now, in order to test the affect of the variable (heterogeneous vs. homogenous work groups) this table will be divided to track changes between the two surveys. When dealing with averages, the maximum negativity average for each question is five.

Table 3.3
Single Gender Averages Comparisons

	Survey A1 Male Averages	Survey A2 Male Averages
Question 5	3.13	3.05
Question 6	2.79	2.54
Question 7	2.1	2.2
Question 8	3.38	3.42
Question 9	2.83	2.92
Question 10	2.83	2.76
Question 11	1.94	1.91
Question 12	2.56	2.52
Question 13	3.08	2.94
Question 14	2.75	2.37
Question 15	2.88	3.68
Question 16	1.58	1.76
Cov = .24	N = 52	N = 54
r = .86	$\Sigma = 31.85$	$\Sigma = 32.07$
t = .83	Avg. = 2.654	Avg. = 2.67
	s = .527	s = .574
	Var = .277	Var = .33

	A1 Female Averages	A2 Female Averages
Question 5	2.73	2.65
Question 6	2.33	2.22
Question 7	1.92	2
Question 8	3.19	3.04
Question 9	2.75	2.65
Question 10	2.71	2.41
Question 11	1.79	1.67
Question 12	2.29	2.15
Question 13	3	2.8
Question 14	2.39	2.22
Question 15	2.75	3.56
Question 16	1.37	1.46
Cov = .25	N = 48	N = 46
r = .87	$\Sigma = 29.22$	$\Sigma = 28.83$
t = .7	Avg. = 2.43	Avg. = 2.4
	s = .53	s = .583
	Var = .282	Var = .34

The data shows that the answers for both genders are unlikely to significantly fluctuate between the two surveys ($r = .86$ for men and $r = .87$ for women). The results of

the t-tests for both genders also indicate that the differences between the two surveys are minor. In other words, the variable had little impact on the responses.

The following tables examine the differences in the responses of the two genders in each survey:

Table 3.4
Average Comparisons Between Genders

	Survey A1 Male Averages	Survey A1 Female Averages
Question 5	3.13	2.73
Question 6	2.79	2.33
Question 7	2.1	1.92
Question 8	3.38	3.19
Question 9	2.83	2.75
Question 10	2.83	2.71
Question 11	1.94	1.79
Question 12	2.56	2.29
Question 13	3.08	3
Question 14	2.75	2.39
Question 15	2.88	2.75
Question 16	1.58	1.37
Cov = .25	N = 52	N = 48
r = .97	$\Sigma = 31.85$	$\Sigma = 29.22$
t = .00009	Avg. = 2.654	Avg. = 2.43
	s = .527	s = .53
	Var = .277	Var = .282

	Survey A2 Male Averages	Survey A2 Female Averages
Question 5	3.05	2.65
Question 6	2.54	2.22
Question 7	2.2	2
Question 8	3.42	3.04
Question 9	2.92	2.65
Question 10	2.76	2.41
Question 11	1.91	1.67
Question 12	2.52	2.15
Question 13	2.94	2.8
Question 14	2.37	2.22
Question 15	3.68	3.56
Question 16	1.76	1.46
Cov = .3	N = 54	N = 46
r = .98	$\Sigma = 32.07$	$\Sigma = 28.83$
t = .000001	Avg. = 2.67	Avg. = 2.4

	s = .574	s = .583
	Var = .33	Var = .34

With these tables, it becomes evident that the male participants, on average, responded more negatively than the females on every question across both surveys. Men have an average score of 2.654 for Survey A1 and an average of 2.67 for Survey A2, while women have averages of 2.43 and 2.4. However, in terms of data fluctuations, the correlation coefficients ($r = .97$ for Survey A1 and $r = .98$ for Survey A2) show a strongly positive relationship between the responses of the two genders. Additionally, the t-test results for the two surveys ($t = .00009$ for Survey A1 and $t = .000001$ for Survey A2) yield results that are far below the critical values. Once again, the tested variable caused minimal variation in the results.

The following table compares the combined results for both genders across both surveys:

Table 3.5
Total Average Comparison for Gender

	Total Male Averages	Total Female Averages
Question 5	3.09	2.69
Question 6	2.66	2.28
Question 7	2.15	1.96
Question 8	3.4	3.12
Question 9	2.88	2.7
Question 10	2.79	2.56
Question 11	1.92	1.73
Question 12	2.54	2.22
Question 13	3.01	2.9
Question 14	2.56	2.31
Question 15	3.29	3.15
Question 16	1.67	1.41
Cov = .26	N = 106	N = 94
r = .99	$\Sigma = 31.96$	$\Sigma = 29.03$
t = .000001	Avg. = 2.66	Avg. = 2.42
	s = .533	s = .54
	Var = .284	Var = .291

This table further illustrates the higher average negativity levels of male respondents compared to their female counterparts. Furthermore, this table also highlights the positive relationship between the male and the female responses ($r = .99$).

Job Type Analysis

The following tables display the total results, using the negativity scale, for the two surveys divided by job type:

**Table 4.1
Survey A1 Job Type Comparison**

	Sales	Support	Management	Administration	Service	Instructor/Teacher	Other
Question 5	39	35	99	26	23	25	47
Question 6	32	30	82	22	24	22	45
Question 7	28	26	63	19	16	18	31
Question 8	36	43	111	26	25	28	60
Question 9	34	41	83	26	20	27	48
Question 10	46	36	87	25	24	23	48
Question 11	27	24	54	17	15	20	30
Question 12	31	35	72	22	20	18	45
Question 13	36	44	94	22	23	26	59
Question 14	29	34	67	24	23	28	53
Question 15	34	36	94	23	20	27	48
Question 16	21	20	43	16	12	12	24
	N = 12	N = 13	N = 34	N = 8	N = 6	N = 10	N = 17
	$\Sigma = 393$	$\Sigma = 404$	$\Sigma = 949$	$\Sigma = 268$	$\Sigma = 245$	$\Sigma = 274$	$\Sigma = 538$
	Avg. = 32.75	Avg. = 33.66	Avg. = 79.08	Avg. = 22.33	Avg. = 20.42	Avg. = 22.83	Avg. = 44.83
	s = 6.34	s = 7.47	s = 19.85	s = 3.45	s = 4.12	s = 5	s = 11.19
	Var. = 40.93	Var. = 55.88	Var. = 393.9	Var. = 11.88	Var. = 16.99	Var. = 25.06	Var. = 125.24

Table 4.2
Survey A2 Job Type Comparison

	Sales	Support	Management	Administration	Service	Instructor/Teacher	Other
Question 5	40	33	73	27	38	24	52
Question 6	35	26	58	25	32	22	41
Question 7	35	28	54	22	24	12	36
Question 8	51	38	86	28	41	22	59
Question 9	40	32	65	31	37	27	48
Question 10	37	31	62	29	36	21	42
Question 11	26	20	46	19	22	12	33
Question 12	34	30	53	23	32	15	48
Question 13	39	42	64	29	35	26	52
Question 14	36	24	52	22	34	19	42
Question 15	62	40	94	40	41	27	59
Question 16	26	17	45	17	17	13	27
	N = 16	N = 11	N = 27	N = 10	N = 11	N = 8	N = 17
	$\Sigma = 461$	$\Sigma = 361$	$\Sigma = 752$	$\Sigma = 312$	$\Sigma = 389$	$\Sigma = 240$	$\Sigma = 539$
	Avg. = 38.42	Avg. = 30.08	Avg. = 62.67	Avg. = 26	Avg. = 32.42	Avg. = 20	Avg. = 44.92
	s = 9.9	s = 7.67	s = 15.18	s = 6.15	s = 7.62	s = 5.74	s = 9.96
	Var. = 98.08	Var. = 58.81	Var. = 230.42	Var. = 37.82	Var. = 58.08	Var. = 32.91	Var. = 99.17

The split between the seven job categories is far from even, with a disproportionate 30.5% of the respondents falling into the “Management” category. Consequently, it’s once again useful to convert this data into averages. The following tables display the job type data converted into averages:

Table 4.3
Survey A1 Job Type Comparison (Averages)

	Sales	Support	Management	Administration	Service	Instructor/Teacher	Other
Question 5	3.25	2.69	2.91	3.25	3.83	2.5	2.76
Question 6	2.66	2.31	2.41	2.75	4	2.2	2.65
Question 7	2.33	2	1.85	2.37	2.66	1.8	1.82
Question 8	3	3.31	3.26	3.25	4.17	2.8	3.53
Question 9	2.83	3.15	2.44	3.25	3.33	2.7	2.82
Question 10	3.83	2.77	2.56	3.12	4	2.3	2.82
Question 11	2.25	1.85	1.56	2.12	2.5	2	1.76
Question 12	2.58	2.69	2.12	2.75	3.33	1.8	2.65
Question 13	3	3.38	2.76	2.75	3.83	2.6	3.47
Question 14	2.42	2.61	1.97	3	3.83	2.8	3.12
Question 15	2.83	2.77	2.76	2.87	3.33	2.7	2.82
Question 16	1.75	1.54	1.26	2	2	1.2	1.41
	N = 12	N = 13	N = 34	N = 8	N = 6	N = 10	N = 17
	Σ = 32.73	Σ = 31.07	Σ = 27.86	Σ = 33.48	Σ = 40.81	Σ = 27.4	Σ = 31.63
	Avg. = 2.77	Avg. = 2.59	Avg. = 2.32	Avg. = 2.79	Avg. = 3.4	Avg. = 2.28	Avg. = 2.63
	s = .53	s = .57	s = .59	s = .43	s = .69	s = .5	s = .66
	Var = .28	Var = .33	Var = .34	Var = .19	Var = .47	Var = .25	Var = .43

Table 4.4
Survey A2 Job Type Comparison (Averages)

	Sales	Support	Management	Administration	Service	Instructor/Teacher	Other
Question 5	2.5	3	2.7	2.7	3.45	3	3.06
Question 6	2.19	2.36	2.15	2.5	2.91	2.75	2.41
Question 7	2.19	2.54	2	2.2	2.18	1.5	2.12
Question 8	3.19	3.45	3.18	2.8	3.73	2.75	3.47
Question 9	2.5	2.91	2.41	3.1	3.36	3.37	2.82
Question 10	2.31	2.82	2.3	2.9	3.27	2.62	2.47
Question 11	1.62	1.82	1.7	1.9	2	1.5	1.94
Question 12	2.12	2.73	1.96	2.3	2.91	1.87	2.82
Question 13	2.44	3.82	2.37	2.9	3.18	3.25	3.06
Question 14	2.25	2.18	1.92	2.2	3.09	2.37	2.47
Question 15	3.87	3.64	3.48	4	3.73	3.37	3.47
Question 16	1.62	1.54	1.67	1.7	1.54	1.62	1.59
	N = 16	N = 11	N = 27	N = 10	N = 11	N = 8	N = 17
	$\Sigma = 28.8$	$\Sigma = 32.81$	$\Sigma = 27.84$	$\Sigma = 31.2$	$\Sigma = 35.35$	$\Sigma = 29.97$	$\Sigma = 31.7$
	Avg. = 2.4	Avg. = 2.73	Avg. = 2.32	Avg. = 2.6	Avg. = 2.94	Avg. = 2.5	Avg. = 2.64
	s = .62	s = .7	s = .56	s = .61	s = .69	s = .72	s = .58
	Var. = .38	Var. = .49	Var. = .31	Var. = .38	Var. = .48	Var. = .51	Var. = .34

In both surveys, the respondents in the “Service” category stands out as having the highest negativity scores in terms of average responses. On Survey A1, the “Service” category has the most negative average response for every question. On Survey A2, it has the most negative average response for nine out of twelve questions. In two of the remaining three questions (#7 and #9), “Service” misses the highest average score by only .1. The only instance when the “Service” category is significantly lower than

another in terms of negativity is question #13 on Survey A2. For whatever reason, those in the “Support” category are particularly negative (with an average score of 3.83) toward this question (the statement for which states “When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy”).

In terms of the most positive respondents, there isn’t a category that particularly stands out. On Survey A1, “Instructor/Teacher” is overall the most positive category with an average score of 2.28. On Survey A2, “Management” is the most positive overall category with an average score of 2.32. However, no category is as clearly and consistently the most positive job-type as “Service” is clearly and consistently the most negative job-type.

For individual questions, the patterns in the job-type data generally parallel those in the overall data and the gender-divided data. Each job-type registered above-average negativity for question #8 and #15 (although the negativity level for #15 is far higher on Survey A2) and below-average negativity for question #11 and #16.

In order to illustrate the differences in the responses between the two surveys, the following tables display each job-type category separately:

Table 4.5
Average Comparisons Between Job Types

	Survey A1 Sales Averages	Survey A2 Sales Averages
Question 5	3.25	2.5
Question 6	2.66	2.19
Question 7	2.33	2.19
Question 8	3	3.19
Question 9	2.83	2.5
Question 10	3.83	2.31
Question 11	2.25	1.62
Question 12	2.58	2.12
Question 13	3	2.44
Question 14	2.42	2.25

Question 15	2.83	3.87
Question 16	1.75	1.62
Cov = .14	N = 12	N = 16
r = .46	$\Sigma = 32.73$	$\Sigma = 28.8$
t = .09	Avg. = 2.77	Avg. = 5.5
	s = .53	s = .62
	Var = .28	Var. = .38

	Survey A1 Support Averages	Survey A2 Support Averages
Question 5	2.69	3
Question 6	2.31	2.36
Question 7	2	2.54
Question 8	3.31	3.45
Question 9	3.15	2.91
Question 10	2.77	2.82
Question 11	1.85	1.82
Question 12	2.69	2.73
Question 13	3.38	3.82
Question 14	2.61	2.18
Question 15	2.77	3.64
Question 16	1.54	1.54
Cov = .32	N = 13	N = 11
r = .86	$\Sigma = 31.07$	$\Sigma = 32.81$
t = .18	Avg. = 2.59	Avg. = 2.73
	s = .57	s = .7
	Var = .33	Var. = .49

	Survey A1 Management Averages	Survey A2 Management Averages
Question 5	2.91	2.7
Question 6	2.41	2.15
Question 7	1.85	2
Question 8	3.26	3.18
Question 9	2.44	2.41
Question 10	2.56	2.3
Question 11	1.56	1.7
Question 12	2.12	1.96
Question 13	2.76	2.37
Question 14	1.97	1.92
Question 15	2.76	3.48
Question 16	1.26	1.67
Cov = .26	N = 34	N = 27
r = .85	$\Sigma = 27.86$	$\Sigma = 27.84$
t = .98	Avg. = 2.32	Avg. = 2.32

	s = .59	s = .56
	Var = .34	Var. = .31

	Survey A1 Administration Averages	Survey A2 Administration Averages
Question 5	3.25	2.7
Question 6	2.75	2.5
Question 7	2.37	2.2
Question 8	3.25	2.8
Question 9	3.25	3.1
Question 10	3.12	2.9
Question 11	2.12	1.9
Question 12	2.75	2.3
Question 13	2.75	2.9
Question 14	3	2.2
Question 15	2.87	4
Question 16	2	1.7
Cov = .15	N = 8	N = 10
r = .63	$\Sigma = 33.48$	$\Sigma = 31.2$
t = .19	Avg. = 2.79	Avg. = 2.6
	s = .43	s = .61
	Var. = .19	Var. = .38

	Survey A1 Service Averages	Survey A1 Service Averages
Question 5	3.83	3.45
Question 6	4	2.91
Question 7	2.66	2.18
Question 8	4.17	3.73
Question 9	3.33	3.36
Question 10	4	3.27
Question 11	2.5	2
Question 12	3.33	2.91
Question 13	3.83	3.18
Question 14	3.83	3.09
Question 15	3.33	3.73
Question 16	2	1.54
Cov = .37	N = 6	N = 11
r = .85	$\Sigma = 40.81$	$\Sigma = 35.35$
t = .001	Avg. = 3.4	Avg. = 2.94
	s = .69	s = .69
	Var. = .47	Var. = .48

	Survey A1 Instructor/Teacher Averages	Survey A2 Instructor/Teacher Averages
Question 5	2.5	3
Question 6	2.2	2.75

Question 7	1.8	1.5
Question 8	2.8	2.75
Question 9	2.7	3.37
Question 10	2.3	2.62
Question 11	2	1.5
Question 12	1.8	1.87
Question 13	2.6	3.25
Question 14	2.8	2.37
Question 15	2.7	3.37
Question 16	1.2	1.62
Cov = .26	N = 10	N = 8
r = .79	$\Sigma = 27.4$	$\Sigma = 29.97$
t = .12	Avg. = 2.28	Avg. = 2.5
	s = .5	s = .72
	Var. = .25	Var. = .51

	Survey A1 Other Averages	Survey A2 Other Averages
Question 5	2.76	3.06
Question 6	2.65	2.41
Question 7	1.82	2.12
Question 8	3.53	3.47
Question 9	2.82	2.82
Question 10	2.82	2.47
Question 11	1.76	1.94
Question 12	2.65	2.82
Question 13	3.47	3.06
Question 14	3.12	2.47
Question 15	2.82	3.47
Question 16	1.41	1.59
Cov = .29	N = 17	N = 17
r = .83	$\Sigma = 31.63$	$\Sigma = 31.7$
t = .96	Avg. = 2.63	Avg. = 2.64
	s = .66	s = .58
	Var. = .43	Var. = .34

Although these tables contain quite a bit of data, they can be summarized quite succinctly. In short, the racial composition of the respondent's department didn't significantly affect the results in any of the job-type categories. The responses in all of the job-type categories have a positive correlation across the two surveys. The "Sales"

category has the least positive correlation ($r = .46$) while the “Support” category has the strongest positive correlation ($r = .86$). Although the affect of the variable isn’t considered statistically significant in any category, the variable had the greatest impact on those in the “Sales” category and the largest difference among individual questions is with question #15.

Age Range Analysis

The following tables display the total results, using the negativity scale, for the two surveys divided by age range:

**Table 5.1
Survey A1 Age Range Comparison**

	18-21	21-30	31-40	41 – 50	51 – 60	61 – 70	71+
Question 5	No Data	75	59	79	55	29	2
Question 6	No Data	71	49	67	50	23	2
Question 7	No Data	48	47	62	32	22	2
Question 8	No Data	89	62	84	62	29	2
Question 9	No Data	72	55	75	52	26	2
Question 10	No Data	71	57	77	56	23	2
Question 11	No Data	49	38	54	33	18	2
Question 12	No Data	68	43	64	43	21	1
Question 13	No Data	87	54	75	55	22	2
Question 14	No Data	69	51	71	48	20	2
Question 15	No Data	74	56	76	51	22	2
Question 16	No Data	41	30	41	26	14	
		N = 24	N = 20	N = 27	N = 20	N = 7	N = 1
		$\Sigma = 814$	$\Sigma = 601$	$\Sigma = 825$	$\Sigma = 563$	$\Sigma = 269$	$\Sigma = 21$
		Avg. = 67.83	Avg. = 50.08	Avg. = 68.75	Avg. = 46.92	Avg. = 22.21	Avg. = 1.9
		s = 14.81	s = 9.32	s = 12.06	s = 11.13	s = 4.25	s = .3

		Var. = 219.24	Var. = 86.81	Var. = 145.48	Var. = 123.9	Var. = 18.08	Var. = .09
--	--	------------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------	---------------

Table 5.2
Survey A2 Age Range Comparison

	18-21	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71+
Question 5	8	129	26	60	40	20	2
Question 6	5	109	23	49	36	15	2
Question 7	9	91	26	38	29	16	2
Question 8	12	147	34	65	44	21	2
Question 9	10	123	30	54	44	18	2
Question 10	9	111	25	53	43	16	1
Question 11	8	78	18	37	26	11	1
Question 12	10	108	23	42	36	13	1
Question 13	9	144	28	49	40	14	1
Question 14	6	106	21	48	34	13	1
Question 15	11	148	44	77	57	23	3
Question 16	4	72	16	32	28	9	1
	N = 3	N = 41	N = 12	N = 22	N = 15	N = 6	N = 1
	$\Sigma = 101$	$\Sigma = 1366$	$\Sigma = 314$	$\Sigma = 604$	$\Sigma = 457$	$\Sigma = 189$	$\Sigma = 19$
	Avg. = 8.42	Avg. = 113.83	Avg. = 16.16	Avg. = 50.33	Avg. = 38.08	Avg. = 15.75	Avg. = 1.58
	s = 2.39	s = 25.54	s = 7.48	s = 12.74	s = 8.61	s = 4.16	s = .67
	Var. = 5.72	Var. = 652.15	Var. = 55.97	Var. = 162.24	Var. = 74.08	Var. = 17.29	Var. = .45

As with the other demographic classifications, there isn't an even split between the categories in the age-range data. In fact, there is barely any data for two of the categories (the 18-21 and 71+ ranges). For the 18-21 range, there are no responses for Survey A1 and only three responses for Survey A2. The 71+ category has only one response per survey. The 61-70 category also has a noticeable lack of respondents, with only 13

responses across both surveys. On Survey A1, the remaining responses are fairly evenly split between the remaining four categories (encompassing respondents between the ages of 21 and 60). However, Survey A2 features a highly disproportionate quantity of respondents in the 21-30 range (41% of the survey's total respondents).

Again, as with the other demographic categories, this data is easier to interpret and analyze after a conversion to averages. Since the 71+ category has only one respondent per survey, this category has been omitted from the age-range average data tables.

Although the 18-21 range contains no data for Survey A1, this category is included in these tables in order to maintain a consistent format that is conducive to data comparisons.

Table 5.3
Survey A1 Age Range Comparison (Averages)

	18-21	21-30	31-40	41 - 50	51 - 60	61 - 70
Question 5	No Data	3.12	2.95	2.92	2.75	4.14
Question 6	No Data	2.96	2.45	2.48	2.5	3.28
Question 7	No Data	2	2.35	2.23	1.6	3.14
Question 8	No Data	3.71	3.1	3.11	3.1	4.14
Question 9	No Data	3	2.75	2.78	2.6	3.71
Question 10	No Data	2.96	2.85	2.85	2.8	3.28
Question 11	No Data	2.04	1.9	2	1.65	2.57
Question 12	No Data	2.83	2.15	2.37	2.15	3
Question 13	No Data	3.62	2.7	2.78	2.75	3.14
Question 14	No Data	2.87	2.55	2.63	2.4	2.86
Question 15	No Data	3.08	2.8	2.81	2.55	3.14
Question 16	No Data	1.71	1.5	1.52	1.3	2
		N = 24	N = 20	N = 27	N = 20	N = 7
		$\Sigma = 33.9$	$\Sigma = 30.05$	$\Sigma = 30.48$	$\Sigma = 28.15$	$\Sigma = 38.4$
		Avg. = 2.825	Avg. = 2.5	Avg. = 2.54	Avg. = 2.34	Avg. = 3.2
		s = .62	s = .46	s = .45	s = .56	s = .61
		Var. = .38	Var. = .22	Var. = .2	Var. = .31	Var. = .37

Table 5.4
Survey A2 Age Range Comparison (Averages)

	18-21	21-30	31-40	41 – 50	51 – 60	61 – 70
Question 5	2.67	3.15	2.17	2.73	2.67	3.33
Question 6	1.67	2.66	1.92	2.23	2.4	2.5
Question 7	3	2.22	2.17	1.73	1.93	2.67
Question 8	4	3.58	2.83	2.95	2.93	3.5
Question 9	3.33	3	2.5	2.45	2.93	3
Question 10	3	2.71	2.08	2.41	2.87	2.67
Question 11	2.67	1.9	1.5	1.68	1.73	1.83
Question 12	3.33	2.63	1.92	1.91	2.4	2.17
Question 13	3	3.51	2.33	2.23	2.67	2.33
Question 14	2	2.58	1.75	2.18	2.27	2.17
Question 15	3.66	3.61	3.67	3.5	3.8	3.83
Question 16	1.33	1.76	1.33	1.45	1.87	1.5
	N = 3	N = 41	N = 12	N = 22	N = 15	N = 6
	$\Sigma = 33.66$	$\Sigma = 33.31$	$\Sigma = 26.17$	$\Sigma = 27.45$	$\Sigma = 30.47$	$\Sigma = 31.5$
	Avg. = 2.8	Avg. = 2.77	Avg. = 2.18	Avg. = 2.29	Avg. = 2.54	Avg. = 2.62
	s = .8	s = .62	s = .62	s = .58	s = .57	s = .69
	Var. = .63	Var. = .39	Var. = .39	Var. = .33	Var. = .33	Var. = .48

Due to the large discrepancies between the numbers of respondents in each category, it's difficult to make any definitive statements based on the average data. On Survey A1, the 61-70 range is clearly the most negative ($\Sigma = 38.4$, Avg. = 3.2). However, this category also has a very small sample size ($N = 7$). Similarly, the 18-21 group is the most negative on Survey A2 ($\Sigma = 33.66$, Avg. = 2.8), but has an even smaller sample size ($N = 3$). If these two ranges are discounted due to insufficient samples, the 21-30 range becomes the most negative range on both surveys (Survey A1: $\Sigma = 33.9$, Avg. = 2.825; Survey A2: $\Sigma = 33.31$, Avg. = 2.77).

The most positive range of respondents differs between the two surveys. On Survey A1, the 51-60 range is the most positive ($\Sigma = 28.15$, Avg. = 2.34). On Survey A2, the 31-40 range is the most positive ($\Sigma = 26.17$, Avg. = 2.18).

These tables reaffirm the already established patterns that question #8 and #15 are overall the most negatively received and question #16 and #11 are overall the most positively received. More notably, these tables help to explain the cause of the significant variation in the reception of question #15 between the two surveys. As mentioned earlier, question #15 is the second most negatively received question overall, but trails behind question #5 and #13 on Survey A1 only. These tables show that respondents in the 21-30 and 61-70 ranges are noticeably more negative toward question #5 and #13 than those in the middle age ranges. As a reminder, these questions state the following:

Question #5: "The quality of work in my department is likely to decline."

Question #13: "When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy."

In order to illustrate the differences in the responses between the two surveys, the following tables display each age-range category separately. Due to a lack of data, the 18-21 and 71+ categories are not included in these tables.

Table 5.5
Average Comparisons Between Age Ranges

	Survey A1 21-30 Averages	Survey A2 21-30 Averages
Question 5	3.12	3.15
Question 6	2.96	2.66
Question 7	2	2.22
Question 8	3.71	3.58
Question 9	3	3
Question 10	2.96	2.71
Question 11	2.04	1.9
Question 12	2.83	2.63
Question 13	3.62	3.51
Question 14	2.87	2.58
Question 15	3.08	3.61
Question 16	1.71	1.76
Cov = .32	N = 24	N = 41
r = .92	$\Sigma = 33.9$	$\Sigma = 33.31$
t = .49	Avg. = 2.825	Avg. = 2.77
	s = .62	s = .62

	Var. = .38	Var. = .39
--	------------	------------

	Survey A1 31-40 Averages	Survey A2 31-40 Averages
Question 5	2.95	2.17
Question 6	2.45	1.92
Question 7	2.35	2.17
Question 8	3.1	2.83
Question 9	2.75	2.5
Question 10	2.85	2.08
Question 11	1.9	1.5
Question 12	2.15	1.92
Question 13	2.7	2.33
Question 14	2.55	1.75
Question 15	2.8	3.67
Question 16	1.5	1.33
Cov = .18	N = 20	N = 12
r = .7	$\Sigma = 30.05$	$\Sigma = 26.17$
t = .03	Avg. = 2.5	Avg. = 2.18
	s = .46	s = .62
	Var. = .22	Var. = .39

	Survey A1 41 - 50 Averages	Survey A2 41 - 50 Averages
Question 5	2.92	2.73
Question 6	2.48	2.23
Question 7	2.23	1.73
Question 8	3.11	2.95
Question 9	2.78	2.45
Question 10	2.85	2.41
Question 11	2	1.68
Question 12	2.37	1.91
Question 13	2.78	2.23
Question 14	2.63	2.18
Question 15	2.81	3.5
Question 16	1.52	1.45
Cov = .19	N = 27	N = 22
r = .82	$\Sigma = 30.48$	$\Sigma = 27.45$
t = .02	Avg. = 2.54	Avg. = 2.29
	s = .45	s = .58
	Var. = .2	Var. = .33

	Survey A1 51 - 60 Averages	Survey A2 51 - 60 Averages
Question 5	2.75	2.67

Question 6	2.5	2.4
Question 7	1.6	1.93
Question 8	3.1	2.93
Question 9	2.6	2.93
Question 10	2.8	2.87
Question 11	1.65	1.73
Question 12	2.15	2.4
Question 13	2.75	2.67
Question 14	2.4	2.27
Question 15	2.55	3.8
Question 16	1.3	1.87
Cov = .22	N = 20	N = 15
r = .74	$\Sigma = 28.15$	$\Sigma = 30.47$
t = .12	Avg. = 2.34	Avg. = 2.54
	s = .56	s = .57
	Var. = .31	Var. = .33

	Survey A1 61 – 70 Averages	Survey A2 61 – 70 Averages
Question 5	4.14	3.33
Question 6	3.28	2.5
Question 7	3.14	2.67
Question 8	4.14	3.5
Question 9	3.71	3
Question 10	3.28	2.67
Question 11	2.57	1.83
Question 12	3	2.17
Question 13	3.14	2.33
Question 14	2.86	2.17
Question 15	3.14	3.83
Question 16	2	1.5
Cov = .3	N = 7	N = 6
r = .8	$\Sigma = 38.4$	$\Sigma = 31.5$
t = .0005	Avg. = 3.2	Avg. = 2.62
	s = .61	s = .69
	Var. = .37	Var. = .48

As is the case with all of the other demographic comparisons, all categories within this demographic exhibit a positive correlation between responses on both surveys. The strongest correlation is found in the 21-30 range ($r = .92$) and the weakest correlation is found in the 31-40 range ($r = .7$). Again, the greatest disparity is in the responses to question #15.

Education Level Analysis

The following tables display the total results, using the negativity scale, for the two surveys divided by education level:

Table 6.1
Survey A1 Education Level Comparison

	High School	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctoral Degree
Question 5	9	32	83	155	15
Question 6	10	23	73	135	16
Question 7	6	21	60	103	11
Question 8	10	30	101	171	17
Question 9	9	27	82	148	13
Question 10	8	28	79	147	15
Question 11	6	19	57	94	11
Question 12	7	28	76	122	10
Question 13	9	28	93	161	13
Question 14	9	25	79	130	15
Question 15	9	28	80	152	13
Question 16	5	14	45	77	7
	N = 2	N = 9	N = 30	N = 54	N = 5
	$\Sigma = 97$	$\Sigma = 303$	$\Sigma = 908$	$\Sigma = 1595$	$\Sigma = 156$
	Avg. = 8.08	Avg. = 25.25	Avg. = 75.67	Avg. = 132.97	Avg. = 13
	s = 1.68	s = 5.14	S = 15.43	s = 28.9	s = 2.86
	Var. = 2.81	Var. = 26.39	Var. = 238.06	Var. = 834.99	Var. = 8.18

Table 6.2
Survey A2 Education Level Comparison

	High School	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctoral Degree
Question 5	21	23	109	121	13
Question 6	18	21	87	101	12
Question 7	14	16	81	93	7
Question 8	18	24	135	136	12
Question 9	17	19	106	126	12
Question 10	21	19	95	115	10
Question 11	12	15	72	71	10
Question 12	17	20	96	94	8
Question 13	19	20	118	122	9
Question 14	17	18	87	100	8
Question 15	20	28	146	154	15
Question 16	11	14	58	69	10
	N = 5	N = 7	N = 40	N = 44	N = 4
	$\Sigma = 205$	$\Sigma = 237$	$\Sigma = 1190$	$\Sigma = 1302$	$\Sigma = 126$
	Avg. = 17.08	Avg. = 19.75	Avg. = 99.17	Avg. = 108.5	Avg. = 10.5

	s = 3.26	s = 3.96	s = 25.34	s = 25.33	s = 2.35
	Var. = 10.63	Var. = 15.66	Var. = 641.97	Var. = 641.73	Var. = 5.45

The categories in this demographic are highly unbalanced. The vast majority of respondents are in the Bachelor's Degree and Master's Degree categories (168 of the total 200 respondents fall into these categories). On Survey A1, the Master's Degree category accounts for 54% of respondents. The following tables display the education level data converted into averages:

Table 6.3
Survey A1 Education Level Comparison (Averages)

	High School	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctoral Degree
Question 5	4.5	3.55	2.77	2.87	3
Question 6	5	2.55	2.43	2.5	3.2
Question 7	3	2.33	2	1.91	2.2
Question 8	5	3.33	3.37	3.17	3.4
Question 9	4.5	3	2.73	2.74	2.6
Question 10	4	3.11	2.63	2.72	3
Question 11	3	2.11	1.9	1.74	2.2
Question 12	3.5	3.11	2.53	2.26	2
Question 13	4.5	3.11	3.1	2.98	2.6
Question 14	4.5	2.78	2.63	2.41	3
Question 15	4.5	3.11	2.67	2.81	2.6
Question 16	2.5	1.55	1.5	1.42	1.4
	N = 2	N = 9	N = 30	N = 54	N = 5
	$\Sigma = 48.5$	$\Sigma = 33.64$	$\Sigma = 30.26$	$\Sigma = 29.53$	$\Sigma = 31.2$
	Avg. = 4.04	Avg. = 2.8	Avg. = 2.52	Avg. = 2.46	Avg. = 2.6
	s = .84	s = .57	s = .51	s = .53	s = .57
	Var. = .7	Var. = .33	Var. = .26	Var. = .29	Var. = .33

Table 6.4
Survey A2 Education Level Comparison (Averages)

	High School	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctoral Degree
Question 5	4.2	3.28	2.72	2.75	3.25
Question 6	3.6	3	2.17	2.29	3
Question 7	2.8	2.28	2.02	2.11	1.75
Question 8	3.6	3.43	3.37	3.09	3
Question 9	3.4	2.71	2.65	2.86	3
Question 10	4.2	2.71	2.37	2.61	2.5
Question 11	2.4	2.14	1.8	1.64	2.5
Question 12	3.4	2.86	2.4	2.14	2
Question 13	3.8	2.86	2.95	2.77	2.25
Question 14	3.4	2.57	2.17	2.27	2
Question 15	4	4	3.65	3.5	3.75
Question 16	2.2	2	1.45	1.57	2.5
	N = 5	N = 7	N = 40	N = 44	N = 4
	$\Sigma = 41$	$\Sigma = 33.84$	$\Sigma = 29.72$	$\Sigma = 29.6$	$\Sigma = 31.5$
	Avg. = 3.42	Avg. = 2.82	Avg. = 2.48	Avg. = 2.47	Avg. = 2.62
	s = .65	s = .57	s = .63	s = .57	s = .59
	Var. = .42	Var. = .32	Var. = .4	Var. = .33	Var. = .35

Due to the fact that only two of the categories (Bachelor's Degree and Master's Degree) comprise 84% of all responses, the data for the remaining three categories isn't particularly useful. Consequently, these two categories will be the focus of this analysis. The following tables summarize the different responses between the two surveys for each of these two categories:

Table 6.5
Bachelor's Degree Comparison (Averages)

	Survey A1 Bachelor's Degree Averages	Survey A2 Bachelor's Degree Averages
Question 5	2.77	2.72
Question 6	2.43	2.17
Question 7	2	2.02
Question 8	3.37	3.37
Question 9	2.73	2.65
Question 10	2.63	2.37
Question 11	1.9	1.8
Question 12	2.53	2.4
Question 13	3.1	2.95
Question 14	2.63	2.17

Question 15	2.67	3.65
Question 16	1.5	1.45
Cov = .25	N = 30	N = 40
r = .83	$\Sigma = 30.26$	$\Sigma = 29.72$
t = .66	Avg. = 2.52	Avg. = 2.48
	s = .51	s = .63
	Var. = .26	Var. = .4

Table 6.6
Master's Degree Comparison (Averages)

	Survey A1 Master's Degree Averages	Survey A2 Master's Degree Averages
Question 5	2.87	2.75
Question 6	2.5	2.29
Question 7	1.91	2.11
Question 8	3.17	3.09
Question 9	2.74	2.86
Question 10	2.72	2.61
Question 11	1.74	1.64
Question 12	2.26	2.14
Question 13	2.98	2.77
Question 14	2.41	2.27
Question 15	2.81	3.5
Question 16	1.42	1.57
Cov = .25	N = 54	N = 44
r = .89	$\Sigma = 29.53$	$\Sigma = 29.6$
t = .94	Avg. = 2.46	Avg. = 2.47
	s = .53	s = .57
	Var. = .29	Var. = .33

These comparisons are consistent with the patterns already established by the other demographic categories. There is a strong positive correlation between the responses for both surveys in the Bachelor's Degree category ($r = .83$) and the Master's Degree category ($r = .94$). Both categories display above-average negativity for question #8 and #15 while displaying below-average negativity toward question #11 and #16. Both categories are also significantly more negative toward question #15 on Survey A2.

The following tables compare the responses of these two categories on both surveys:

Table 6.7
Average Comparisons Between Education Levels

	Survey A1 Bachelor's Degree Averages	Survey A1 Master's Degree Averages
Question 5	2.77	2.87
Question 6	2.43	2.5
Question 7	2	1.91
Question 8	3.37	3.17
Question 9	2.73	2.74
Question 10	2.63	2.72
Question 11	1.9	1.74
Question 12	2.53	2.26
Question 13	3.1	2.98
Question 14	2.63	2.41
Question 15	2.67	2.81
Question 16	1.5	1.42
Cov = .24	N = 30	N = 54
r = .96	$\Sigma = 30.26$	$\Sigma = 29.53$
t = .16	Avg. = 2.52	Avg. = 2.46
	s = .51	s = .53
	Var. = .26	Var. = .29

	Survey A2 Associate's Degree Averages	Survey A2 Master's Degree Averages
Question 5	3.28	2.75
Question 6	3	2.29
Question 7	2.28	2.11
Question 8	3.43	3.09
Question 9	2.71	2.86
Question 10	2.71	2.61
Question 11	2.14	1.64
Question 12	2.86	2.14
Question 13	2.86	2.77
Question 14	2.57	2.27
Question 15	4	3.5
Question 16	2	1.57
Cov = .26	N = 7	N = 44
r = .89	$\Sigma = 33.84$	$\Sigma = 29.6$
t = .0007	Avg. = 2.82	Avg. = 2.47
	s = .57	s = .57
	Var. = .32	Var. = .33

This data shows that the difference in education level between the respondents in these categories had little impact on their responses. Although the Bachelor's Degree

category scored slightly higher on both surveys, the differences are minimal. There is a strongly positive correlation between the categories on both Survey A1 ($r = .96$) and Survey A2 ($r = .89$).

Chapter V: Conclusions & Recommendations

Conclusions

Overall lack of variable impact

As discussed in detail in the previous chapter, the variable tested by this study had little impact on the results of the surveys. In response to the research question first proposed by Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman (2004), white backlash toward diversity initiatives in an organization isn't more likely to manifest itself in heterogeneous versus homogeneous work groups (e.g., greater group conflict, less cohesiveness). The responses to the different scenarios in this research exhibited similar levels of negativity (or backlash) regardless of this variable.

The case of question #15

Although the tested variable didn't have a significant impact on the overall data, the responses to the fifteenth question are considerably different between the two surveys and this is the only instance in which the variable had a noticeable affect on the respondents' negativity levels. Repeated for the sake of discussion, the eleventh question of the surveys stated the following:

Survey A1 (employees' department is directly affected by increased diversity): "If given the chance, I will switch to another department."

Survey A2 (employees' department is not directly affected by increased diversity): "If given the chance, I would switch to a department that has been affected by this policy."

The following table summarizes the average responses to the two versions of this question across all demographic categories:

Table 7
Question #15 Data Summary (Averages)

Category	Sub-Category	Survey A1	Survey A2
Gender			
	Male	2.88	3.68
	Female	2.75	3.56
Job Type			
	Sales	2.83	3.87
	Support	2.77	3.64
	Management	2.76	3.48
	Administration	2.87	4
	Service	3.33	3.73
	Instructor/Teacher	2.7	3.37
	Other	2.82	3.47
Age Range			
	21-30	3.08	3.61
	31-40	2.8	3.67
	41-50	2.81	3.5
	51-60	2.55	3.8
	61-70	3.14	3.83
Education Level			
	Bachelor's Degree	2.67	3.65
	Master's Degree	2.81	3.5
Cov = .0078			
r = .25			

Note that, as with the tables in the previous chapter, several demographic categories have been omitted from this table due to small sample sizes.

Unlike the combined results discussed in the previous chapter, the responses to this question varied significantly between the two surveys (Cov = .0078, $r = .25$). Although there is still a positive correlation between the two sets of responses, this correlation is much weaker than in any of the other data comparisons.

Given the differences in the phrasing of the question between the surveys, it's possible that the tested variable may not have been the most significant factor in the responses. In order to respond negatively in the scenario on Survey A1, an employee would have to commit an act that could lead to accusations of racism. Specifically, they

would have to take the opportunity to switch to a department that hasn't been affected by the diversity initiatives and is still primarily white. Such a move could be deemed an admittance of racism and a preference to work with other white employees.

A negative response in the Survey A2 scenario, however, requires a passive choice rather than an action. Most respondents wouldn't voluntarily switch to a department that has been affected by diversity initiatives, implying a preference to work with other white employees. Although such a preference could be considered racist by fellow employees, such a preference wouldn't be accompanied by an action under these circumstances. Consequently, employees may feel that accusations of racism would be less likely to materialize in this scenario.

Taking this into account, the results for this question may not have been dictated by levels of negativity toward diversity, but rather the perceived chances of being accused of racism. Consequently, this question may not have accurately tested the intended variable, but instead opened the doors to a new topic in this field: The perceived danger of actively communicated racial preferences versus the perceived safety of passively communicated racial preferences. Another possible interpretation of question #15 will be discussed in the next section.

Probable causes and manifestations of backlash

By looking at the most negatively and positively received questions, some generalizations can be made about the type of backlash that is likely to be generated among Caucasians in response to diversity initiatives. As already discussed, the aforementioned question #15 is one of the two most negatively received questions in this

research. The other of the two most poorly received questions is #8, which states the following:

Question #8: "The new minority workers benefited from lowered hiring standards."

Conversely, the two most positively received statements are found in question #11 and #16.

Question #11: "I am just as likely to help my minority co-workers as I am my white co-workers."

Question #16: "I would be more likely to sabotage the work of a minority worker than that of a white worker."

The most negative responses (for #8 and #16) deal with professional concerns.

Negativity towards question #8 implies a perceived lack of integrity in the company's hiring practices. As was discussed in the previous section, the implications of question #15 are a little more complex. However, general negativity toward question #15 could be viewed as negativity toward the metamorphosis of the company and the resulting potentially unstable work environment, and not as negativity toward the minority workers themselves. Caucasian workers seem to be concerned about how diversity initiatives will impact their work environment and routines for professional, rather than racist, reasons (i.e., they are concerned about turnover and efficiency, not race). In other words, in the case of both question #8 and #15, Caucasian backlash is likely to be directed at the company itself for a seeming lack of integrity and stability, while the minority employees may only be seen as innocent bystanders rather than targets of racist backlash.

The overwhelmingly positive response to question #11 and #16 further implies a lack of racial malice on the part of Caucasian workers. The results suggest that Caucasians are unlikely to treat the minority workers differently even if those same Caucasians are

unhappy about the company's diversity policies. Furthermore, the results show that Caucasians are unlikely to treat minority workers differently than they would other white workers.

This distinction between professional and personal concerns helps explain why the tested variable (heterogeneous vs. homogenous work groups) had little affect on the results. Quite simply, the respondents don't care about the racial composition of their specific department because their gripe is with the company itself and not with their minority co-workers. They may not be fond of the corporate philosophy and policies behind the increased diversity, but they exhibit little animosity toward minorities for taking advantage of those policies and philosophy. In summation, Caucasian workers tend to view diversity as a corporate and professional (not personal) issue and backlash is more likely to be directed at the company itself than at minority employees.

Recommendations

During the process of conducting this research, several recommendations for future studies in this field have become increasingly apparent. These include strategies for refining and improving the research method used for this study and suggestions for new areas of research. Finally, this research suggests some guidelines for successfully integrating Caucasians into a newly diverse work environment with *minimal* negativity and backlash.

Increased demographic diversity

Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this study is a decided lack of diversity in the population sample. Several demographic categories have such minor representations in this research that they were consciously omitted from most tables and statistical

calculations. In particular, participants in this study lacked sufficient variety in terms of age and, particularly, education level. The vast majority of respondents are between the ages of 21 and 60, and the results are therefore missing the perspective of those that are just starting to work and those who are on the verge of retiring. In terms of education level, most respondent's have either a Bachelor's or a Master's Degree. Consequently, it's unknown how the results would change if they were to include more participants without a college education.

With these limitations in mind, future research in this vein should attempt to impose strict demographic quotas in order to better asses the influence of such demographic variables.

The justification variable

As discussed in Chapter I, this research is an extension of a study done by Kidder, Lankau, Chrobot-Mason, Mollica & Friedman (2004). Those researchers studied corporate diversity initiatives in terms of two justifications: affirmative action and increased profit. This study only examined the "increased profit" justification. Consequently, this subject matter is ripe for further study using the "affirmative action" justification. By varying the justification for diversity in scenarios similar to those in this study, it could be determined if the justification variable affects the heterogeneous-homogenous comparison.

Suggestions for further research

In addition to refinements for future studies of the heterogeneous-homogenous variable, this research identified two other areas that require further study. First, the analysis of question #15 revealed that Caucasians are quite possibly more concerned with

the perception of racism than they are about racism itself. As a result, studies of Caucasian racism (or lack of racism) may be repeatedly skewed by dishonest feedback caused by the white fear of being labeled a racist. Future studies could ask: Are the actions of Caucasians toward minorities in the workplace determined more by their actual attitudes about race or by their estimation of what actions will lead to accusations of racism? Will Caucasians avoid performing professionally responsible tasks if those tasks could conceivably lead to accusations of racism? For instance, if a white worker suspects theft by a minority worker, will a diversity-conscious work environment cause the Caucasian to hesitate coming forward with the accusation out of the fear of being branded a racist?

Secondly, this study largely examined the way in which Caucasians view both diversity and minority workers that benefit from corporate diversity initiatives. However, the results indicate that a greater issue may be how Caucasians view and respond to employers that have intentionally increased diversity. This study suggests that white backlash against diversity is more likely to be directed at a company that at minority employees. If this is true, in what ways is white backlash likely to manifest in the employer-employee relationship? How can employers avoid creating such negative feelings in their white employees?

Although this study has attempted to add to the body of knowledge on the concept of diversity management, there is clearly a need for future research in this field. These suggestions outline specific questions that could be addressed to add further to the professional and academic understanding of this increasingly vital topic.

Suggestions for future diversity initiatives

The results of this research suggest that Caucasians respond negatively to corporate attempts to increase diversity for professional, rather than personal, reasons. When Caucasians are offended by such initiatives, it's not necessarily because of racist beliefs against minority workers, but because of distrust toward the business philosophy that that brought in those minority workers. Caucasians are often fearful that such changes will disrupt their work environment and routines, not because of new *minority* workers, but simply because of *new* workers. Most people are more comfortable with what they already know, and who they already work with, than they are with the unknowns of change, and diversity initiatives are intrinsically associated with change. The survey results (going back to the analysis of question #15) suggest that Caucasians oppose diversity initiatives because they bring change itself, not necessarily because they bring racial change.

Consequently, when attempting to increase diversity among a primarily-white workforce, it's important to remember that race may not be the primary issue that needs to be addressed. Instead, the bigger issue may be change itself and the need to implement these changes without disrupting the flow and procedures of the already established work environment (assuming that the already established work environment was acceptably efficient). New co-workers, regardless of race, must be given ample time and resources to facilitate an easy assimilation into their new work environment. Similarly, the established workers, regardless of race, must be given the chance to get used to these changes and adjust to the new relationships and routines that come with new co-workers. More simply

put, it's better to emphasize the fact that new co-workers are meeting each other and downplay the fact that new white and minority co-workers are meeting each other.

This could be done in a number of ways and different human resource departments will take different approaches. However, there are two basic strategies that may help when integrating a newly-diverse workforce. First, ensure that the increased diversity is introduced at a relatively low-pressure time. Employees will likely respond more negatively to changes in their environment and routines when they are already struggling to meet deadlines. Second, introduce training exercises that will allow the new and established employees to work together in a professional, yet low-pressure, situation before they begin embarking on real projects together.

In addition to deemphasizing race and ensuring professional continuity through effective team building, companies must ensure that the white employees don't suspect a lack of integrity in the hiring standards for the new workers. The survey results show that Caucasians often feel that minority workers benefit from lowered standards and lack adequate qualifications. This, in turn, makes them question the integrity of the company and fear a downturn in efficiency.

For these reasons, employers must clearly state the requirements for each position within the company and make these requirements well known to all current employees. When a new employee is hired (either white or minority), their professional biography should be available to the rest of the company. Depending on the company, this could be done via intranet, email or as a posting on an old-fashioned bulletin board. Regardless of the method for dispensing this information, Caucasians must know these qualifications so that they don't suspect unfair hiring practices. This will help to ensure that white

employees don't doubt either the integrity of their employer or the credentials of their fellow employees.

References

- Abrams, L., & Moio, J. (2009, Spring/Summer). Critical race theory and the cultural competence dilemma in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(2), 245-261. Retrieved September 10, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Arai, M., Wanca-Thibault, M., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2001). Communication theory and training approaches for multiculturally diverse organizations: Have academics and practitioners missed the connection? *Public Personnel Management, 30* (4), 445-456.
- Baron, R.A., & Neuman J.H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*, 161-173
- Barry, B. & Bateman, T.S. (1996). A social trap analysis of the management of diversity. *Public Personnel Management, 21* (3), 757-790.
- Beebe, S.A., & Masterson, J.T. (1994). *Communicating in small groups: Principles and Practices*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Bergen, C.W., Soper, B., & Foster, T. (2002). Unintended negative effects of diversity management. *Public Personnel Management, 31* (2), 239-252.
- Burstein, P. (1991, December). Reverse discrimination cases in the federal courts: Legal mobilization by a countermovement. *Sociological Quarterly, 32*(4), 511-528. Retrieved September 9, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Davis, L. (1980). When the majority is the psychological minority. *Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama & Sociometry, 33*, 179-184. Retrieved September 10, 2009, from PsycINFO database.
- Farber, D. (1994, July). The outmoded debate over affirmative action. *California Law Review, 82*(4), 893. Retrieved September 10, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Gates, D. (1993, March). White male paranoia. *Newsweek, 48*. Retrieved September 14, 2009 from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Gilbert, J.A. (2000a). An empirical examination of resources in a diverse environment. *Public Personnel Management, 29*(2), 175-184
- Gilbert, J.A. (2000b). Diversity management: Time for a new approach. *Public Personnel Management, 29* (1), 75-92

- Glenn, D. (2008, April 25). Our hidden prejudices on trial. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(33), B12-B14. Retrieved September 9, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Green, A., Carney, D., Pallin, D., Ngo, L., Raymond, K., Lezzoni, L., et al. (2007, September). Implicit bias among physicians and its prediction of thrombolysis decisions for black and white patients. *JGIM: Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22(9), 1231-1238. Retrieved September 9, 2009
- Greenwald, A., & Krieger, L. (2006, July). Implicit bias: Scientific foundations. *California Law Review*, 94(4), 945-967. Retrieved September 8, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Gullett, C.R. (2000). Reverse discrimination and remedial affirmative action in employment: Dealing with the paradox of nondiscrimination. *Public Personnel Management*, 29 (1), 107-118
- Hon, L.C., & Brunner, B. (2000). Diversity issues and public relations. *Public Personnel Management*, 12 (4), 309-340.
- Hopkins, W.E., & Hopkins, S.A. (2002). Effects of cultural recomposition on group interaction processes. *Public Personnel Management*, 27 (4), 541-553.
- Jeffries Jr., J. (2003, January). Bakke Revisited. *Supreme Court Review*, Retrieved September 9, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Johnson, P.R., & Indvick, J. (2000). Rebels, criticizers, backstabbers, and busybodies: Anger and aggression at work. *Public Personnel Management*, 29 (2), 165-174.
- Joll, C., & Sunstein, C. (2006, July). The law of implicit bias. *California Law Review*, 94(4), 969-996. Retrieved September 9, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Keller, S. (1976, May). Reply to Borgatta's "the concept of reverse discrimination and equality of opportunity. *American Sociologist*, 11(2), 79-82. Retrieved September 9, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Kidder, D., Lankau, M., Chrobot-Mason, D., Mollica, K., & Friedman, R. (2004, January). Backlash toward diversity initiatives: Examining the impact of diversity program justification, personal and group outcomes. *International Journal of Conflict Management (2004-2005)*, 15(1), 77-102. Retrieved September 15, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Knouse, S., & Dansby, M. (1999, September). Percentage of work-group diversity and work-group effectiveness. *Journal of Psychology*, 133(5), 486. Retrieved September 7, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.

- Kotkin, M. (2009, April). Diversity and discrimination: A look at complex bias. *William & Mary Law Review*, 50(5), 1439-1500. Retrieved September 6, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Larkey, L.K. (1996). Toward a theory of communicative interactions in culturally diverse workgroups. *Public Personnel Management*, 21 (2), 463-491.
- Lerner, R., & Nagai, A. (2000, Summer). Reverse discrimination by the numbers. *Academic Questions*, 13(3), 71. Retrieved September 7, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Milliken, F.J., & Martins, L.L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Public Personnel Management*, 21 (2), 402-433.
- Nemetz, P.L., & Christensen, S.L. (1996). The challenge of cultural diversity: Harnessing a diversity of views to understand multiculturalism. *Public Personnel Management*, 21 (2), 434-462.
- Pitts, D.W., (2003). *Diversity, representation, & performance: evidence about race and ethnicity in public organizations*. Athens: University of Georgia, School of Public & International Affairs
- Posner, R. (1979, January). The Bakke case and the future of 'affirmative action'. *California Law Review*, 67(1), 171. Retrieved September 9, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Richey, W. (2009, April 23). Reverse-discrimination case splits Supreme Court. *Christian Science Monitor*, Retrieved September 14, 2009, from MAS Ultra - School Edition database.
- Roberts, R., Swanson, N., & Murphy, L. (2004, April). Discrimination and occupational mental health. *Journal of Mental Health*, 13(2), 129-142. Retrieved September 14, 2009 from Academic Search Premier database.
- Robinson, R.K., Paolillo, J.G., & Reithel, B.J. (1998). Race-based preferential treatment programs: Raising the bar for establishing compelling government interests. *Public Personnel Management*, 27 (3), 349-360.
- Rossum, R. (1985, July). Plessy, Brown, and the reverse discrimination cases. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 28(6), 785. Retrieved September 9, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.

Sterba, J. (2003, Summer2003). Defending affirmative action, defending preferences. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 34(2), 285-300. Retrieved September 29, 2009 from Academic Search Premier database.

Tamburri, R. (2009, May). Think globally, recruit locally: A diverse workplace can give companies a competitive advantage, experts say. One accounting firm in particular is making strides. *The Globe and Mail*, B8. Retrieved September 16, 2009 from LexisNexis Academic database.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). Retrieved September 7, 2009, from <http://www.bls.gov/cps/demographics.htm#race>

Vaughn, B.E. (n.d.). *History of diversity management: The history of diversity training & its pioneers*. Retrieved September 7, 2009 from http://diversityofficermagazine.com/magazine/?page_id=65

**Appendix A:
Bureau of Labor Statistics Charts**

Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey

Series Id: LNU02000003
 Not Seasonally Adjusted
Series title: (Unadj) Employment Level - White
Labor force status: Employed
Type of data: Number in thousands
Age: 16 years and over
Race: White

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
1999	110414	110949	111414	111439	112160	113011	113425	112846	112241	112890	112919	113116	112235
2000	112616	113046	113510	114567	114418	115469	115342	114925	114470	114952	114696	115081	114424
2001	113876	114215	114669	114423	114521	115106	115416	114332	114313	114431	114008	113849	114430
2002	112188	113307	113372	113583	114132	114683	114951	114689	114476	114691	114165	113916	114013
2003	112735	113376	113630	114057	114016	114868	114884	114531	114093	114996	114935	114702	114235
2004	113348	113834	113921	114557	115049	115831	116487	116007	115451	116151	116247	115978	115239
2005	114756	115188	115529	116395	116916	117471	118069	118021	117420	117898	117921	117803	116949
2006	116745	116967	117498	118141	118509	119488	119834	119575	119265	120053	119995	119923	118633
2007	118392	118573	119375	119231	119719	120592	120635	119790	120103	120424	120665	120004	119792
2008	118505	118395	118827	119341	119603	120191	120357	119475	119294	119389	118721	117409	119126
2009	115320	115182	114831	115587	115444	115772	115861	115173					

Series Id: LNU02000006
 Not Seasonally Adjusted
Series title: (Unadj) Employment Level - Black or African American
Labor force status: Employed
Type of data: Number in thousands
Age: 16 years and over
Race: Black or African American

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
1999	14835	14622	14798	14979	15058	15156	15146	15156	15113	15215	15292	15302	15056
2000	15277	15390	15446	15100	14959	15050	15048	14960	14930	15147	15298	15262	15156
2001	14878	14902	14988	15061	15056	15165	15217	14957	15024	14946	14869	15005	15006
2002	14658	14689	14659	14840	14925	14895	14871	14919	15113	15111	14837	14951	14872
2003	14496	14491	14558	14726	14817	14810	14784	14794	14855	14777	14931	14828	14739
2004	14655	14650	14793	14856	14797	14917	14964	15023	15057	15137	15029	15033	14909
2005	14720	14688	14917	15150	15338	15512	15655	15573	15574	15742	15395	15487	15313
2006	15231	15405	15596	15638	15796	15816	15809	15946	15740	16041	16021	16138	15765
2007	15973	15888	15874	15997	15957	16091	16307	16268	16142	16085	16027	15999	16051
2008	15856	15947	16010	16207	16015	16165	16132	16132	15767	15847	15705	15649	15953
2009	15274	15108	15074	15119	15047	15174	15218	15005					

Series Id: LNU02032183
 Not Seasonally Adjusted
Series title: (Unadj) Employment Level - Asian
Labor force status: Employed
Type of data: Number in thousands
Age: 16 years and over
Race: Asian

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
2000	5729	5806	5820	5977	6051	6109	6156	6174	6150	6170	6207	6169	6043
2001	6126	6199	6234	6245	6193	6183	6305	6120	6150	6141	6176	6090	6180
2002	6050	6066	6049	6115	6122	6189	6283	6316	6398	6337	6331	6322	6215
2003	5698	5645	5672	5681	5769	5728	5800	5828	5747	5777	5789	5938	5756
2004	5892	5900	5971	5956	5926	5947	6008	6018	6006	6028	6149	6130	5994
2005	6115	6092	6175	6160	6158	6213	6244	6300	6284	6387	6483	6400	6244
2006	6357	6437	6511	6447	6454	6512	6573	6511	6648	6597	6565	6657	6522
2007	6680	6760	6810	6723	6836	6887	6949	6917	6776	6805	6900	6958	6839
2008	6935	6942	6928	6985	6881	6903	7030	6978	6904	6870	6791	6857	6917
2009	6588	6597	6656	6659	6690	6719	6780	6709					

Series Id: LNU02000009
 Not Seasonally Adjusted
Series title: (Unadj) Employment Level - Hispanic or Latino
Labor force status: Employed
Type of data: Number in thousands
Age: 16 years and over
Ethnic origin: Hispanic or Latino

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
1999	13293	13420	13595	13474	13613	13750	13767	13872	13818	13922	14001	14112	13720
2000	15407	15430	15426	15667	15685	15854	15636	15719	15946	16047	15921	16085	15735
2001	15880	16017	16156	16220	16162	16055	16271	16252	16316	16427	16228	16294	16190
2002	16071	16390	16312	16307	16605	16664	16787	16711	16831	16742	16741	16713	16590
2003	16908	17083	17123	17443	17288	17361	17300	17386	17513	17610	17666	17785	17372
2004	17169	17170	17534	17798	18037	18117	18203	18185	18143	18305	18258	18236	17930
2005	17839	18031	18331	18485	18693	18753	18816	18840	18688	18978	19052	19084	18632
2006	18969	19116	19290	19528	19685	19806	19699	19588	19536	19977	20006	20131	19613
2007	19888	19946	20191	20328	20329	20365	20454	20647	20546	20656	20701	20534	20382
2008	20011	20146	20162	20456	20699	20499	20505	20485	20470	20327	20263	20139	20346
2009	19453	19388	19485	19895	19673	19685	19849	19511					

Series Id: LNS12000029
 Seasonally Adjusted
Series title: (Seas) Employment Level - 20 yrs. & over, White Women
Labor force status: Employed
Type of data: Number in thousands
Age: 20 years and over
Race: White
Sex: Women

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
1999	47802	47907	47839	47803	47992	48214	48031	48191	48103	48323	48428	48644	
2000	48993	48997	49063	49449	49008	49099	49101	48815	49201	49256	49255	49552	
2001	49613	49550	49763	49383	49338	49244	49358	49250	49270	49195	49254	49217	
2002	49146	49526	49397	49408	49392	49353	49411	49545	49575	49582	49530	49466	
2003	49787	49747	49884	49902	49751	50052	49846	49807	49524	49838	49829	49840	
2004	49632	49891	49899	49925	50151	50094	50047	50076	50065	50125	50231	50251	
2005	50327	50330	50245	50473	50523	50292	50648	50743	50757	50762	50904	50983	
2006	50912	50972	50970	51108	51207	51361	51548	51601	51420	51681	51646	51817	
2007	51881	51901	52106	51646	51881	51927	51956	51992	52179	52079	52211	52148	
2008	52162	52043	52101	52180	52182	52255	52169	52113	52233	52178	52014	51846	
2009	51601	51624	51519	51695	51385	51304	51245	51250	50914	50875			

Series Id: LNS12000032

Seasonally Adjusted

Series title: (Seas) Employment Level - 20 yrs. & over, Black or African American Women

Labor force status: Employed

Type of data: Number in thousands

Age: 20 years and over

Race: Black or African American

Sex: Women

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
1999	7599	7522	7549	7652	7636	7655	7684	7683	7773	7750	7766	7687	
2000	7741	7755	7768	7706	7708	7681	7634	7638	7629	7695	7722	7751	
2001	7712	7773	7831	7823	7817	7822	7831	7737	7674	7650	7593	7626	
2002	7607	7585	7512	7552	7551	7571	7552	7615	7684	7670	7693	7721	
2003	7669	7552	7635	7653	7768	7665	7617	7663	7628	7593	7688	7515	
2004	7613	7678	7712	7759	7621	7615	7795	7744	7736	7764	7723	7752	
2005	7767	7749	7733	7790	7853	7861	7897	7912	7969	8091	7973	7935	
2006	7968	7974	8030	7982	8061	8021	8064	8182	7999	8153	8194	8207	
2007	8313	8269	8254	8238	8227	8270	8247	8244	8232	8220	8178	8203	
2008	8282	8285	8326	8359	8260	8291	8291	8218	8097	8213	8249	8256	
2009	8194	8115	8045	8025	7993	8018	7988	7889	7828	7806			

Series Id: LNU02000035

Not Seasonally Adjusted

Series title: (Unadj) Employment Level - 20 yrs. & over, Hispanic or Latino Women

Labor force status: Employed

Type of data: Number in thousands

Age: 20 years and over

Ethnic origin: Hispanic or Latino

Sex: Women

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
1999	5102	5204	5262	5113	5263	5345	5207	5297	5352	5399	5422	5514	5290
2000	5841	5838	5814	5804	5871	5821	5699	5800	6040	6093	6127	6094	5903
2001	6092	6122	6197	6046	6087	6011	6046	6168	6123	6215	6147	6195	6121
2002	6196	6328	6320	6370	6313	6329	6370	6399	6486	6432	6421	6437	6367
2003	6509	6491	6501	6591	6493	6516	6447	6495	6520	6622	6643	6666	6541
2004	6468	6547	6689	6780	6872	6852	6736	6834	6787	6868	6765	6827	6752
2005	6717	6754	6842	6888	6938	6881	6871	6900	6881	7048	7096	7135	6913
2006	7142	7191	7155	7284	7347	7402	7317	7307	7235	7449	7437	7588	7321
2007	7489	7582	7594	7590	7630	7605	7598	7779	7796	7811	7760	7707	7662
2008	7531	7620	7606	7774	7874	7680	7650	7761	7760	7721	7745	7765	7707
2009	7566	7578	7645	7740	7619	7542	7541	7536	7655	7718			

**Appendix B:
Surveys**

Dear Sir or Madame,

I thank you for taking a few moments to complete the following survey. This research is being done in order to fulfill requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Strategic Communication at Seton Hall University.

My research deals with the response of white employees to increases in workplace diversity. The scenario and questions are designed to assess how you would feel and react in the given situation. Basically, the survey asks if increased diversity has a positive or negative affect on white workers.

First, you will be asked a few basic demographic questions. You will then be asked to read a scenario and answer 12 questions based on that scenario. In total, the survey should only take a few minutes of your time.

Your participation in this survey is purely voluntary and highly appreciated. By completing this survey, you are giving consent to include your responses in the results. The results are completely anonymous and will be stored on a USB that will be locked in a secure site. I thank you in advance for your time.

Michael Dooney
Graduate Student
Seton Hall University

A 1

1. What type of job do you have?

1. Sales 2. Support 3. Management 4. Administration
5. Service 6. Instructor/Teacher 7. Other

2. What is your gender?

1. Male 2. Female

3. What is your age?

1. 18 – 20 2. 21 – 30 3. 31 – 40
4. 41 – 50 5. 51 – 60 6. 61 – 70 7. 71+

4. What is your level of education? If you are currently working on a degree, include that degree as your education level.

- High School Associate's Degree Bachelor's Degree
Master's Degree Doctoral Degree

Please read the following scenario, then respond to the questions that follow.

Your company's customer base has become increasingly racially diverse. Upper management has decided that it's important to have employees that reflect this diversity and understand the customer base in order to increase profits. The company doesn't have an affirmative action plan, but has voluntarily implemented a diversity initiative to actively seek, hire and promote minority group members. No more white workers will be hired or promoted until the company feels that the employees accurately reflect the customer base.

Your department has been directly affected by this new policy. Your group of co-workers goes from being primarily white (80% white) to being evenly split between whites and minorities (50% white).

5. The quality of work in my department is likely to decline.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

6. I am likely to become less interested in my job.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

7. I will try to become friends with my new minority co-workers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

8. The new minority workers benefited from lowered hiring standards

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

9. I would start looking for a new job because I may end up losing my job because I'm white.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

10. I would start looking for a new job because I am offended by this policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. I am just as likely to help my minority co-workers as I am my white co-workers.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably expression irritation toward the minority workers.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. When I am with both my white and minority co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

15. If given the chance, I will switch to another department.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

16. I would be more likely to sabotage the work of a minority worker than that of a white worker.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

A 2

1. What type of job do you have?

1. Sales 2. Support 3. Management 4. Administration
5. Service 6. Instructor/Teacher 7. Other

2. What is your gender?

1. Male 2. Female

3. What is your age?

1. 18 – 20 2. 21 – 30 3. 31 – 40
4. 41 – 50 5. 51 – 60 6. 61 – 70 7. 71+

4. What is your level of education? If you are currently working on a degree, include that degree as your education level.

1. High School 2. Associate's Degree 3. Bachelor's Degree
4. Master's Degree 5. Doctoral Degree

Please read the following scenario, then respond to the questions that follow.

Your company's customer base has become increasingly racially diverse. Upper management has decided that it's important to have employees that reflect this diversity and understand the customer base in order to increase profits. The company doesn't have an affirmative action plan, but has voluntarily implemented a diversity initiative to actively seek, hire and promote minority group members. No more white workers will be hired or promoted until the company feels that the employees accurately reflect the customer base.

Your department has not been directly affected by this new policy. Your group of co-workers has remained primarily white (80% white) while other departments around you have gone from primarily white to only half white (50% white).

5. The quality of work in other departments is likely to decline.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

6. I am likely to become less interested in my job.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

7. I will try to become friends with my new minority co-workers from the other departments.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

8. The new minority workers benefited from lowered hiring standards.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

9. I would start looking for a new job because I may end up losing my job because I'm white.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	---------	----------	----------------------

10. I would start looking for a new job because I am offended by this policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. I am just as likely to help my minority co-workers as I am my white co-workers.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably expression irritation toward the minority workers.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. When I am with both my white and minority co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

15. If given the chance, I would switch to a department that has been affected by this policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

16. I would be more likely to sabotage the work of a minority worker than that of a white worker.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

**Appendix C:
Raw Survey Results**

Note: Some data doesn't add up to 100 because respondents either refrained from answering a question or entered two responses.

Michael Dooney, Basic Member

Home

Create Survey

My Surveys

Support/Help
My Contacts

My Account

Log Out

A1

Edit & Review

Invite & Deploy

Analyze Results

Share Results

Results » Individual Responses » Raw Data Export

Results Overview

Filter: No filter applied



Want to ensure your results are statistically valid? Send your survey to more people using Zoomerang Sample- It's fast and affordable. [Get a quote](#)

Print | Excel Export

Report

Results Overview

New Cross Tab Report

Comparison

New Comparison Rpt

Filter

New Filter

Statistics

Show Statistics

Responses

- Completes
- Partial
- Screen Outs
- Over Quota



Survey Coach

- » Learn how to use filters
- » View a demo of reporting

A1

Survey Status: Closed Launched: 10/28/2009 4:01 PM Closed: 1/18/2010 5:34 PM

Email Invites: 0	Visits: 192	Partial: 0	Screen Outs: 0	Over Quota: 0	Completes: 100 (Does not include blank responses)
------------------	-------------	------------	----------------	---------------	---

1. What type of job do you have?

1. Sales		12	12%
2. Support		13	13%
3. Management		34	34%
4. Administration		10	10%
5. Service		6	6%
6. Instructor/Teacher		10	10%
7. Other		17	17%

2. What is your gender?

1. Male		52	52%
2. Female		48	48%

3. What is your age?

1. 18-20		0	0%
2. 21-30		24	24%
3. 31-40		20	20%
4. 41-50		27	27%
5. 51-60		20	20%
6. 61-70		7	7%
7. 71+		1	1%

4. What is your level of education? If you are currently working on a degree, include that degree as your education level.

1. High School		2	2%
2. Associate's Degree		9	9%
3. Bachelor's Degree		31	31%
4. Master's Degree		55	55%
5. Doctoral Degree		5	5%

Please read the following scenario, then respond to the questions that follow. Your company's customer base has become increasingly racially diverse. Upper management has decided that it's important to have employees that reflect this diversity and understand the customer base in order to increase profits. The company doesn't have an affirmative action plan, but has voluntarily implemented a diversity initiative to actively seek, hire and promote minority group members. No more white workers will be hired or promoted until the company feels that the employees accurately reflect the customer base. Your department has been directly affected by this new policy. Your group of co-workers goes from being primarily white (80% white) to being evenly split between whites and minorities (50% white).

Results

5. The quality of work in my department is likely to decline.

Strongly Agree	██████████	13	13%
Agree	██████████	21	21%
Neutral	██████████	24	24%
Disagree	██████████	31	31%
Strongly Disagree	██████	11	11%
Total		100	100%

6. I am likely to become less interested in my job.

Strongly Agree	██████	11	11%
Agree	██████████	15	15%
Neutral	██████	12	12%
Disagree	██████████	43	43%
Strongly Disagree	██████████	19	19%
Total		100	100%

7. I will try to become friends with my new minority co-workers.

Strongly Agree	██████████	29	29%
Agree	██████████	47	47%
Neutral	██████████	16	16%
Disagree	███	6	6%
Strongly Disagree	█	2	2%
Total		100	100%

8. The new minority workers benefited from lowered hiring standards.

Strongly Agree	██████████	22	22%
Agree	██████████	25	26%
Neutral	██████████	27	28%
Disagree	██████████	14	14%
Strongly Disagree	██████████	10	10%
Total		98	100%

9. I would start looking for a new job because I may end up losing my job because I'm white.

Strongly Agree	██████	11	11%
Agree	██████████	24	24%
Neutral	██████████	16	16%
Disagree	██████████	32	32%
Strongly Disagree	██████████	17	17%
Total		100	100%

10. I would start looking for a new job because I am offended by this policy.

Strongly Agree	██████	8	8%
Agree	██████████	20	20%
Neutral	██████████	24	24%
Disagree	██████████	33	33%
Strongly Disagree	██████████	15	15%
Total		100	100%

11. I am just as likely to help my minority co-workers as I am my white co-workers.

Strongly Agree	██████████	38	38%
----------------	------------	----	-----

Results

Agree		47	47%
Neutral		8	8%
Disagree		6	6%
Strongly Disagree		1	1%
Total		100	100%

12. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably expression irritation toward the minority workers.

Strongly Agree		8	8%
Agree		15	15%
Neutral		11	11%
Disagree		44	44%
Strongly Disagree		22	22%
Total		100	100%

13. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree		17	17%
Agree		28	28%
Neutral		12	12%
Disagree		29	29%
Strongly Disagree		14	14%
Total		100	100%

14. When I am with both my white and minority co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree		6	6%
Agree		21	21%
Neutral		16	16%
Disagree		37	37%
Strongly Disagree		20	20%
Total		100	100%

15. If given the chance, I will switch to another department.

Strongly Agree		15	15%
Agree		9	9%
Neutral		26	26%
Disagree		40	40%
Strongly Disagree		10	10%
Total		100	100%

16. I would be more likely to sabotage the work of a minority worker than that of a white worker.

Strongly Agree		1	1%
Agree		0	0%
Neutral		7	7%
Disagree		31	32%
Strongly Disagree		59	60%
Total		98	100%

Michael Dooney, Basic Member

Home

Create Survey

My Surveys

Support/Help
My Contacts

My Account

Log Out

A2

Edit & Review

Invite & Deploy

Analyze Results

Share Results

Results » Individual Responses » Raw Data Export

Results Overview
Filter: No filter applied



Want to ensure your results are statistically valid? Send your survey to more people using Zoomerang Sample- it's fast and affordable. [Get a quote](#)

Print | Excel Export

Report

Results Overview

New Cross Tab Report

Comparison

New Comparison Rpt

Filter

New Filter

Statistics

Show Statistics

Responses

- Completes
- Partials
- Screen Outs
- Over Quota



Survey Coach

- Learn how to use filters
- View a demo of reporting

A2

Survey Status: Closed Launched: 10/28/2009 4:06 PM Closed: 1/13/2010 7:46 AM

Email Invites: 0	Visits: 212	Partials: 0	Screen Outs: 0	Over Quota: 0	Completes: 101 (Does not include blank responses)
------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------	---------------	---

1. What type of job do you have?

1. Sales		16	16%
2. Support		12	12%
3. Management		28	28%
4. Administration		12	12%
5. Service		11	11%
6. Instructor/Teacher		8	8%
7. Other		17	17%

2. What is your gender?

1. Male		53	52%
2. Female		48	48%

3. What is your age?

1. 18-20		3	3%
2. 21-30		41	41%
3. 31-40		12	12%
4. 41-50		22	22%
5. 51-60		16	16%
6. 61-70		6	6%
7. 71+		1	1%

4. What is your level of education? If you are currently working on a degree, include that degree as your education level.

High School		6	6%
Associate's Degree		9	9%
Bachelor's Degree		40	40%
Master's Degree		44	44%
Doctoral Degree		4	4%

Please read the following scenario, then respond to the questions that follow. Your company's customer base has become increasingly racially diverse. Upper management has decided that it's important to have employees that reflect this diversity and understand the customer base in order to increase profits. The company doesn't have an affirmative action plan, but has voluntarily implemented a diversity initiative to actively seek, hire and promote minority group members. No more white workers will be hired or promoted until the company feels that the employees accurately reflect the customer base. Your department has not been directly affected by this new policy. Your group of co-workers has remained primarily white (80% white) while other departments around you have gone from primarily white to only half white (50% white).

5. The quality of work in other departments is likely to decline.

Strongly Agree		9	9%
Agree		24	24%
Neutral		24	24%
Disagree		33	33%
Strongly Disagree		11	11%
Total		101	100%

6. I am likely to become less interested in my job.

Strongly Agree		4	4%
Agree		13	13%
Neutral		17	17%
Disagree		50	50%
Strongly Disagree		17	17%
Total		101	100%

7. I will try to become friends with my new minority co-workers.

Strongly Agree		18	18%
Agree		59	58%
Neutral		18	18%
Disagree		4	4%
Strongly Disagree		2	2%
Total		101	100%

8. The new minority workers benefited from lowered hiring standards.

Strongly Agree		14	14%
Agree		35	35%
Neutral		22	22%
Disagree		23	23%
Strongly Disagree		7	7%
Total		101	100%

9. I would start looking for a new job because I may end up losing my job because I'm white.

Strongly Agree		8	8%
Agree		19	19%
Neutral		26	26%
Disagree		40	40%
Strongly Disagree		8	8%
Total		101	100%

10. I would start looking for a new job because I am offended by this policy.

Strongly Agree		6	6%
Agree		15	15%
Neutral		27	27%
Disagree		38	38%
Strongly Disagree		14	14%
Total		100	100%

11. I am just as likely to help my minority co-workers as I am my white co-workers.

Strongly Agree		37	37%
----------------	--	----	-----

Results

Agree		49	49%
Neutral		11	11%
Disagree		2	2%
Strongly Disagree		1	1%
Total		100	100%

12. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably expression irritation toward the minority workers.

Strongly Agree		5	5%
Agree		15	15%
Neutral		14	14%
Disagree		45	45%
Strongly Disagree		22	22%
Total		101	100%

13. When I am only with my white co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree		10	10%
Agree		28	28%
Neutral		18	18%
Disagree		30	30%
Strongly Disagree		14	14%
Total		100	100%

14. When I am with both my white and minority co-workers, I will probably express irritation toward the company for creating this policy.

Strongly Agree		1	1%
Agree		18	18%
Neutral		15	15%
Disagree		45	45%
Strongly Disagree		21	21%
Total		100	100%

15. If given the chance, I would switch to a department that has been affected by this policy.

Strongly Agree		1	1%
Agree		5	5%
Neutral		34	34%
Disagree		44	44%
Strongly Disagree		17	17%
Total		101	100%

16. I would be more likely to sabotage the work of a minority worker than that of a white worker.

Strongly Agree		2	2%
Agree		1	1%
Neutral		8	8%
Disagree		30	30%
Strongly Disagree		60	59%
Total		101	100%

**Appendix D:
Individual Cases**

Note: Each row represents an individual respondent.

Answer Key

Demographics:

J = Job, G = Gender, A = Age, E = Education

Job:

1 = Sales, 2 = Support, 3 = Management, 4 = Administration, 5 = Service, 6 = Instructor/Teacher, 7 = Other

Gender:

1 = Male, 2 = Female

Age:

1 = 18-21, 2 = 21-30, 3 = 31-40, 4 = 41-50, 5 = 51-60, 6 = 61-70, 7 = 71+

Education:

1 = High School, 2 = Associate's Degree, 3 = Bachelor's Degree, 4 = Master's Degree, 5 = Doctoral Degree

Question Responses:

**1 = Highly Positive, 2 = Positive, 3 = Neutral,
4 = Negative, 5 = Highly Negative**

Survey A1 Individual Results

J	G	A	E	Q. #5	Q. #6	Q. #7	Q. #8	Q. #9	Q.# 10	Q.# 11	Q. #12	Q. #13	Q. #14	Q. #15	Q. #16
7	1	2	5	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	4	4	2	1
7	2	4	4	4	4	1	4	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	1
7	1	4	4	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	1
7	2	3	4	2	2	1	3	4	2	1	2	4	2	3	1
7	1	3	4	3	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	2	2	4	3	3	2	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	2
7	2	2	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	1	2	4	3	4	2	3	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	1
7	2	4	3	3	4	3	5	5	5	2	3	5	5	5	2
7	1	4	3	1	1	2	.	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	1
7	2	3	3	4	4	1	4	3	4	1	4	4	4	3	1
7	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	5	4	2	1
7	2	2	3	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	2	1	3	1
7	1	2	3	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	1	2	3	4	2	2	5	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	1
7	1	2	3	3	3	2	4	1	2	2	3	4	3	2	1
7	2	6	2	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	3
6	2	7	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	.
6	1	5	5	2	4	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
6	2	5	4	4	2	2	3	4	3	2	1	4	4	3	1
6	2	5	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
6	2	5	4	5	5	2	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	2
6	1	5	4	3	3	3	5	4	4	2	2	3	3	3	1
6	1	3	4	4	2	2	5	1	2	1	2	5	5	4	1
6	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2
6	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	4	2	1
5	1	5	5	4	4	1	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	2	1
5	2	4	3	2	3	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
5	1	4	3	5	5	2	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	3
5	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	4	5	2	4	5	2	2	2
5	1	2	3	5	5	3	5	5	4	3	5	5	4	5	3
5	1	2	1	5	5	3	5	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	2
4	1	6	4	4	2	4	5	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	2
4	1	5	4	3	4	1	1	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	1
4	1	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2
4	1	2	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
4	1	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
4	1	2	3	3	2	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	3	1
4	2	5	2	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
4	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	2	4	3	1
3	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	3
3	2	6	4	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1

3	2	5	4	2	2	1	3	4	4	1	2	4	2	2	1
3	2	5	4	4	2	2	4	4	3	2	4	4	2	5	2
3	1	5	4	4	2	1	5	3	4	1	2	4	2	3	1
3	1	5	4	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1
3	1	5	4	2	4	2	4	1	4	1	3	5	4	2	2
3	2	4	4	4	2	2	4	2	3	1	2	4	3	2	1
3	2	4	4	3	2	3	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	1
3	2	4	4	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	2	1
3	2	4	4	2	2	3	2	4	2	2	2	3	2	4	2
3	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
3	2	4	4	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	4	4	2	2	1	3	1	3	2	1	2	1	3	2
3	1	4	4	5	2	2	1	3	3	1	2	3	2	2	1
3	1	4	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	2	5	5	3	5	1
3	2	3	4	3	2	1	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2
3	2	3	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	3	1
3	2	3	4	3	2	2	3	2	4	3	2	3	2	3	1
3	1	3	4	2	2	1	3	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1
3	1	3	4	3	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	1
3	1	3	4	3	2	2	4	3	2	1	2	2	3	3	1
3	1	3	4	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
3	1	3	4	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	1	2	1	2	1
3	2	2	4	4	5	1	4	2	5	1	3	5	2	3	1
3	1	2	4	4	5	2	4	3	3	2	4	4	4	5	2
3	1	2	4	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1
3	1	5	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	2	4	3	4	2	1	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	.
3	2	3	3	4	4	2	5	4	2	2	4	4	1	5	1
3	2	3	3	2	2	2	4	4	3	2	2	4	2	2	1
3	2	4	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
3	1	2	2	5	5	3	5	3	3	1	4	4	1	5	1
2	2	5	4	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
2	1	5	4	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
2	1	5	4	3	5	1	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	1
2	1	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	3	4	1	1	3	1	4	3	1	2	4	2	2	1
2	1	2	4	2	2	1	2	4	2	1	2	4	2	2	2
2	2	4	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	3	2	1
2	1	4	3	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2
2	2	3	3	5	4	2	5	5	2	1	5	5	4	5	2
2	2	2	3	2	1	3	3	1	2	2	1	4	1	1	1
2	2	5	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	4	2	5	2	4	5	5	4	2	5	5	4	5	2
2	2	6	1	4	5	3	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	5	3
1	1	6	4	4	3	3	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1
1	1	6	4	5	4	3	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	3

1	1	6	4	4	3	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
1	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	3	2
1	2	2	4	4	3	2	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	2
1	2	5	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
1	1	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
1	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	2	4	2	2	4	2	2	2
1	1	2	3	5	4	2	5	5	2	2	4	4	4	5	2
1	1	5	2	4	4	2		4	4	2	4	4	4	4	2
1	1		2	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	3	3	2	3	1

Survey A2 Individual Results

J	G	A	E	Q. #5	Q. #6	Q. #7	Q. #8	Q. #9	Q.# 10	Q.# 11	Q. #12	Q. #13	Q. #14	Q. #15	Q. #16
6	2	6	5	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
6	1	5	5	3	4	1	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	2
3	1	4	5	5	4	1	5	4	5	5	3	3	3	5	5
7	1	2	5	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2
3	1	7	4	4	2	2	2	1	3	2	3	4	2	3	1
3	2	6	4	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
1	1	6	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	1
1	1	6	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	5	3
6	2	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	2	2	4	4	3	1
6	2	5	4	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	1
3	1	5	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	1	2	4	2	5	1
3	1	5	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	2
2	1	5	4	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	5
2	1	5	4	4	4	1	4	4	5	1	4	4	2	5	1
7	2	4	4	4	2	2	4	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	1
4	2	4	4	2	2	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
4	1	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
3	2	4	4	4	2	2	4	2	2	1	2	4	3	3	1
3	2	4	4	4	2	3	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	4	1
3	2	4	4	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	1
3	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
3	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2
3	2	4	4	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
3	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2		4	1
3	1	4	4	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2
3	1	4	4	2	2	2	2	3	3		1	3	3	3	1
7	1	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2
3	2	3	4	2	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
3	1	3	4	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	3	1
3	1	3	4	2	2	2	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	1

3	1	3	4	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	2
3	1	3	4	2	2	5	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	4	1
2	1	3	4	1	2	3	1	5	3	1	2	4	2	4	1
1	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
7	2	2	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	2	5	5	4	4	2
7	2	2	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2
6	2	2	4	3	5	1	4	4	2	1	1	4	1	3	1
6	2	2	4	5	3	2	4	4	3	1	1	4	4	3	1
5	1	2	4	5	4	2	5	5	4	2	4	4	3	4	1
4	1	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	2
4	1	2	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4
3	1	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	1	2
3	1	2	4	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	1
3	1	2	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2
2	1	2	4	2	1	4	2	2	2	1	2	4	2	4	1
1	2	2	4	4	3	2	4	2	4	2	4	4	4	2	3
1	2	2	4	2	2	2	5	2	1	1	1	2	2	3	2
1	2	2	4	2	3	2	4	5	3	1	2	4	4	5	1
5	1	5	3	3	3	2	4	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	1
4	2	5	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	1
3	1	5	3	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
3	1	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1	2	5	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2
1	1	5	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	2
7	2	4	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	4	1
7	1	4	3	3	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	1
3	1	4	3	4	2	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
2	2	4	3	3	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	3	3	1
2	1	4	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	2	4	4	4	2	2
7	2	3	3	4	2	2	4	2	3	2	4	4	4	4	1
4	1	3	3	3	1	1	5	3	2	1	2	4	1	3	1
1	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	4	1
1	1	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
7	2	2	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	1
7	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	3	1
7	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	1	2	2	4	3
7	1	2	3	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	1	2	3	4	2	2	5	3	3	2	3	4	2	3	1
7	1	2	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	3	4	4	3	4	3
7	1	2	3	5	4	3	5	4	4	2	5	5	2	4	1
7	1	2	3	3	2	2	4	1	2	2	3	4	2	3	1
6	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	1	3	5	1	3	1
6	2	2	3	5	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	5	5	5	5
5	2	2	3	2	2	1	4	4	4	1	4	5	2	4	2
5	1	2	3	5	5	3	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	3
5	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	1
5	1	2	3	3	2	2	4	4	4	2	2	2	4	4	1

4	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	3	2	4	1
4	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	4	2	4	1
2	2	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	4	1	4	1
2	2	2	3	3	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	5	1	4	1
2	2	2	3	4	1	2	4	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	1
1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	1
1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
1	1	2	3	1	1	2	5	2	2	1	1	4	3	4	1
7	1	1	3	2	1	3	3	4	4	2	4	2	2	4	2
5	1	1	3	2	1	2	4	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	1
2	2	1	3	4	3	4	5	3	3	4	4	4	2	4	1
1	1	6	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	1
1	1	5	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2
5	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	1
4	2	4	2	2	3	2	3	4	4	2	2	2	4	4	1
3	2	4	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	2
3	1	2	2	5	5	3	5	3	2	3	4	4	1	5	5
1	2	2	2	4	3	3	4	2	3	3	4	3	2	5	2
2	2	6	1	4	4	3	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	4	2
4	2	5	1	4	3	3	2	4	5	3	5	5	3	5	3
5	1	4	1	4	4	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	2
5	1	2	1	4	2	3	4	2	3	2	3	4	4	3	2
5	1	2	1	5	5	3	5	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	2