TRANSFORM OR CONFORM? UNRAVELING THE MECHANISMS OF

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN RACIAL-ETHNIC DIVERSITY

MANAGEMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITY FOLLOWERS

by

KERRIN ELLEISE GEORGE

(Under the Direction of Gary Lautenschlager)

ABSTRACT

Transformational leadership has been touted as the type of leadership most prepared to

manage diversity. By fostering an organization-based identity that creates a common in-group

for all followers, transformational leaders are argued to motivate followers to contribute to the

best interests of the group while mitigating intergroup biases and conflicts. Unfortunately, these

dynamics have not yet been examined in the context of racialized hierarchies. When racial-

ethnic inequalities exist, efforts to foster a collective identity have the potential to reinforce the

devaluation of racial-ethnic minorities, thereby pressuring them to conform to oppressive

organizational norms and leading to minority compliance. While minorities' identification and

compliance may both superficially achieve the desired intergroup processes, compliance has

been shown to be detrimental to minorities' inclusion and psychological wellbeing. Thus, we

aimed to illuminate the influence of transformational leaders on the experience of racial-ethnic

minorities in the workplace. Our findings support that transformational leaders are associated

with fostering a value for diversity in organizations, which in turn predicts decreases in minority

followers' need for compliance behaviors. However, transformational leadership maintains a

direct, positive effect on minority followers' organizational identification. Thus, diversity

ideology plays an important role in whether transformational leaders can foster an organizational

identity without pressuring them to relinquish aspects of their racial identity while at work.

INDEX WORDS: Leadership, Diversity Management

TRANSFORM OR CONFORM? UNRAVELING THE MECHANISMS OF

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN RACIAL-ETHNIC DIVERSITY

MANAGEMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITY FOLLOWERS

by

KERRIN ELLEISE GEORGE

B.A., University of Connecticut, 2008

M.S., University of Georgia, 2011

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

TRANSFORM OR CONFORM? UNRAVELING THE MECHANISMS OF

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN RACIAL-ETHNIC DIVERSITY

MANAGEMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITY FOLLOWERS

by

KERRIN ELLEISE GEORGE

Major Professor: Gary Lautenschlager

Committee: Kecia M. Thomas
Karl W. Kuhnert

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2013

DEDICATION

For my parents, Vincent and Marie George, without whose unwavering support and unconditional love this achievement would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Transformational leadership is argued to be the most generally effective form of

leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006), as literature is brimming with research documenting its

positive effects on a variety of follower and organizational outcomes (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Transformational leaders go beyond social exchange relationships to heighten followers'

identification with organizational collectives, making followers feel valued and motivating them

to contribute to shared, internalized or self-concordant goals (Bass, 1985; Bono & Judge, 2005;

Kark & Shamir, 2002; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). The motivational effects of

transformational leadership are argued to be particularly important in both settings that require

interdependence among followers (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2002; Judge &

Piccolo, 2004) and times of change or uncertainty (Bommer, Rich, & Rubin; 2005; Eisenbach,

Watson, & Pillai, 1999; Shamir & Howell, 1999).   As a result, scholars have called for the

examination of the role transformational leadership plays in managing rapid organizational

changes due to increasing workforce demographic diversity, as well as the impact of diversity on

the requirements of transformational leaders (Bass, 1999; Dionne et al., 2002; DiTomaso &

Hooijberg, 1996). We aim to contribute to recent efforts to respond to these calls by unraveling

competing arguments for how transformational leaders manage racial-ethnic diversity and the

implications this has for their influence on minority followers.

Organizations have grappled with how they can mitigate performance inhibiting

intergroup conflict resulting from racial-ethnic diversity in favor of fostering cultural differences

as a resource for organizational growth and competitive advantages (for reviews, see Milliken & Martins, 1996; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998; Van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004; Van Kippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Moreover, racial-ethnic minorities often experience workplace discrimination and report feeling excluded or marginalized at work (Deitch, Barsky, Butz, Chan, Brief, & Bradley, 2003; Foley, Kidder, & Powell, 2002; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormly, 1990; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998), leading to deleterious consequences for organizational effectiveness (e.g., absenteeism, turnover, decreased performance) and minorities' psychological wellbeing (McKay et al., 2007; McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008, 2009; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002). Thus, leaders must respond with appropriate strategies to effectively manage racial-ethnic diversity related changes while promoting an inclusive work environment for minority employees (Shore et al., 2011; Wasserman, Gallegos, & Ferdman, 2007; see also, Nishii & Meyer, 2009; Stewart & Johnson, 2009).

Transformational leaders are argued to mitigate the negative effects of diversity while facilitating its benefits by fostering followers' identification with shared collectives, promoting both cohesion amongst followers despite differences and perceptions that all followers are valued members of the organization (e.g., Bass, 1999; Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Kunze & Bruch, 2010; Shin & Zhou, 2007). Importantly, in the study of these underlying mechanisms, "There is not, however, an equivalent emphasis on the power dynamics of organizational life. The highly contested and racialized hierarchies are either taken for granted or ignored… leaving empirical work on race–ethnicity unattended" (Ospina & Foldy, 2009; p. 885). This is a critical oversight, as efforts to foster collective identification in the face of racial inequalities have the potential to be more consequential for the inclusion of minorities in the workplace (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005).

Scholars have suggested that while transformational leaders may be able to shape goals so that they may be linked to followers' personal values and the fostering of collective identities, these leaders are more likely to be effective when they align goals with the dominant social values of the organization (Shamir & Howell, 1999). Thus, transformational leaders have the potential to espouse visions that are potentially polarizing or incompatible with followers' demographics and the leveraging of minority perspectives (c.f., Greer, Homan, De Hoogh, Den Hartog, & 2012; Hutterman & Boerner, 2012). Consequentially, transformational leaders may emphasize a shared identity that is shaped by dominant group members and pressures minorities to conform to oppressive norms in order to avoid perpetual exclusion in the workplace, shifting their mechanism of influence from organizational identification to minority compliance (c.f., Kelman, 1958, 1961; Hewlin, 2003, 2009). While both organizational identification and compliance may lead to similar behavioral outcomes that can facilitate positive group outcomes, behavior that is inconsistent with one's values has been shown to have negative consequences for minorities' perceived inclusion and psychological well-being (Brickson, 2000; Hewlin, 2009; Roberts, 2005), as well as their ability to leverage their identities for organizational advantages (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Thomas & Ely, 1996). Thus, it is important to understand the strategies underlying the development of organizational identification by transformational leaders and how they may relate to compliance rather than identification.

Notably, there are conflicting arguments for how transformational leaders approach fostering collective identification in diverse groups (e.g., Bass, 1999; Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Kunze & Bruch, 2010; Shin & Zhou, 2007), reflecting the contentious diversity management debate over what ideology should be embraced by organizations to effectively manage racial-ethnic differences (Steven, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005).

On the one hand, recent research has argued that transformational leaders will effectively manage diversity by minimizing differences among followers through the promotion of a superordinate identity based on similarities (e.g., Greer et al., 2012; Kark & Shamir, 2002; Kunze & Bruch, 2010), which aligns with colorblind management of racial-ethnic differences and promoting equality (Stevens, et al, 2008; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005). Unfortunately, colorblindness may threaten the distinctiveness of value identities and facilitate the projection of white norms onto the collective identity, which is often perceived by minorities to be exclusionary and imposes a pressure on minorities' to conform (e.g. Brickson, 2000; Stevens, et al, 2008; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005; Thomas, Mack, & Montagliani, 2004). Alternatively, other researchers have hypothesized that transformational leaders will promote a shared identity while espousing the value or importance of differences and diverse perspectives (e.g., Bass, 1999; Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Shin & Zhou, 2007). This reflects multicultural diversity management, which has been shown to affirm minority identities (e.g., Stevens, et al, 2008; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005; Ely & Thomas, 2001) while promoting collective identification among all followers despite perceived differences (Luijters, van der Zee, & Outten., 2008; van Dick, van Knippenberg, Hagele, Guillaume, & Brodbeck, 2008; van Knippenberg, Haslam, & Platow, 2007).

The current study aimed to expand previous research by clarifying the underlying mechanisms of transformational leadership in managing racial-ethnic diversity and the implications these have for the experience of minority followers, as well as the additional demands racialized hierarchies place on transformational leaders. Using the social identity approach, we argue that transformational leadership behaviors will foster colorblindness, which will in turn have negative ramifications for minorities' organizational identification while

encouraging them to comply by creating a façade of conformity in response to oppressive organizational norms. We suggest that behaviors that convey multicultural competence and sensitivity will allow for transformational leaders to effectively promote multiculturalism, which we expect to be positively related to minority followers' organizational identification and the minimizing of pressures to create a façade of conformity. Furthermore, we argue that beyond race, minorities level of racial-ethnic identification will play an important role in the process of diversity management by transformational leaders, as followers' self-concepts play a role in the influence of transformational leaders (Howell & Shamir, 2005) and is predictive of both minorities' response to different diversity ideologies (Chrobot-Mason & Thomas, 2002; Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten & Matinovic, 2005; Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006) and how they cope with exclusion (Hasalam & Reicher, 2006; Roberts, 2005; Roberts, Settles, & Jellison, 2008).

The Social Identity Approach & Minority Inclusion in the Workplace

Social identity theory (SIT; Taijfel, 1978, 1981; Taijfel & Turner, 1979) and its extension, self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), are social-psychological perspectives used to explain identification with groups and intergroup relations. Social identification is defined as, "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). Social categorization allows individuals to cluster themselves and others based on prototypical group characteristics in order to provide a systematic way of defining the place of themselves and others in society (Tajfel, 1978, 1981; Turner et al., 1987). Depersonalization then occurs, such that one will see themselves and others as representatives of their respective groups and will

internalize the norms and values of their group, leading to the blurring of differences between personal and group identities and behavior in accordance with group prototypes (Turner et al., 1987). The similarity-attraction paradigm also suggests that individuals will prefer interactions with those categorized as in-group members because of convergent values, beliefs, and experiences (Byrne, 1971).

Because one's social reality is largely determined by their social groups, individuals are invested in their group membership and are motivated to protect the status of their in-groups (e.g., in-group favoritism) while achieving positive distinctiveness from other out-groups to which they do not belong (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social dominance theory (SDT) adds that all social systems have a hierarchy such that there is a dominant social identity group at the top and a negatively regarded group at the bottom (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Thus, dominant groups are motivated to maintain the status quo and enhance the hierarchy; whereas, devalued groups aim to improve their social status or the status of their group through efforts to affiliate with the dominant group or reasserting the value of their own group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Brickson (2000) surmises, "although many approaches to understanding the impact of diversity on organizational life have emerged, theorists generally agree that identification processes play a central role in the dynamics that unfold in diverse organizations" (p. 82).

Racial-ethnic differences are a common source of social categorizations, and demographic groups are important to the construction of one's identity in the workplace (Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992). Societal norms and the history of US race relations have created a social hierarchy that is perpetuated by institutional discrimination and other characteristics of organizations (e.g., racial composition, rewards allocation, segregation), whereby whites are awarded higher status and privileges compared to

racial-ethnic minorities (Dreher & Cox, 1996; Ely, 1995, Hogg & Terry, 2000; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005). As dominant group members, whites in organizations may view increasing diversity as a threat to their social status (e.g., Tsui et al., 1992; Ridoran & Shore; 1997), and attempts to enhance minority inclusion within organizations are often faced with resistance that results in backlash and heightened intergroup conflicts (Chrobot-Mason, Ruderman, Weber, Ohlott, & Dalton, 2007; Thomas & Plaut, 2008). In addition, minority distinctiveness in white-dominated organizations also increases their visibility and vulnerability to scrutiny (Steele & Aronson, 1995; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005)

Consequentially, racial-ethnic minorities are stigmatized and continually reinforced as members of devalued social identity groups in organizations, experiencing more discrimination (Deitch et al., 2003; Padilla & Perez, 2003), a lack of social support and inclusion in interpersonal relationships (Elsass & Graves, 1997; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Mor Barak et al., 1998; Millikens & Martins, 1996; Padilla & Perez, 2003; Thomas & Chrobot- Mason, 2005), and less access to professional networks and opportunities for advancement (Elsass & Graves, 1997; Foley et al., 2002; Greenhaus et al., 1990). As a result, minorities come to associate negative social identity contingencies with the workplace and will experience the work environment as threatening to their psychological safety (Padilla & Perez, 2003; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, & Crosby, 2008, Roberts, 2005), undermining their motivation to stay with the organization or to engage with dominant group members (Brickson, 2000; Elsass & Graves, 1996; Millikens & Martins, 1996). Moreover, because racial-ethnic minorities are marginalized, their contributions to tasks are hampered and they have less influence over decision making (Cox, 1994; Elsass & Graves, 1997; Ely & Thomas, 2001). As a result, such intergroup dynamics also undermine the ability of organizations to leverage minority

perspectives for competitive advantages and adaptation (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Thomas & Ely, 1996).

According to Thomas & Chrobot-Mason (2005), "In order for organizations to avoid group-based discrimination and its high financial and productivity costs, companies must construct new identities for its members, or at a minimum, find ways to allow multiple identities to constructively coexist" (p. 76). Van Knippenberg and colleagues (Van Knippenberg et al., 2004; Van Knippenberg & Shippers, 2007) also profess that in order for organizations to minimize the negative consequences associated with diversity in groups, organizations must make efforts to manage the intergroup biases and prejudice that emerge from social categorizations. Organizational leadership is argued to be a critical component of managing followers' social identities to change the salience of differences and/or the value attached to groups attributed a lower status in order to mitigate conflicts that result from diversity (e.g., Chrobot-Mason et al., 2007; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Lord, Brown, & Freiberg,1999) and to promote an inclusive work environment (Chrobot-Mason & Ruderman, 2004; Nishii & Meyer, 2009; Shore et al., 2011; Stewart & Johnson, 2009; Wasserman et al., 2007). Transformational leadership, specifically, has been argued to be particularly effective in increasing the salience of a shared organizational identity among followers (Kark & Shamir, 2002; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993) and has been touted as the most promising leadership approach for managing diversity (Bass, 1999).

The Promise of Transformational Leadership

Bass (1985) proposed that transformational leaders go beyond social exchange relationships to transform follower values and motivation by engaging in behaviors that increase the salience or importance of goals, appeal to the intrinsic, higher-order needs of followers, and

propel followers to embrace a collective identity over the fulfillment of self -interests. Closely related to charismatic forms of leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1998), transformational leaders are typically characterized by four distinct behaviors (Bass & Avoilio, 1995; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). First, transformational leaders possess *idealized influence*, or attributes and/or behaviors that increase followers' respect and admiration for the leader. This includes taking a stand on issues and making emotional appeals to followers. *Inspirational motivation* refers to the articulation of a compelling vision that inspires and motivates followers. This entails communicating high performance expectations, providing meaning for tasks, arousing collective spirit, and conveying an optimistic future of goal attainment. *Intellectual stimulation* involves behaviors that enhance the awareness of problems and encourage new perspectives. Transformational leaders will question follower's assumptions and reframe problems in new ways. They also are willing to take risks and are open to follower's ideas. Lastly, *individualized consideration* involves attention paid to followers' individual needs, involving mentoring or coaching behaviors to develop follower's potential and being attentive to individual's concerns.

Meta-analytic results support the validity of transformational leadership, as it has a positive relationship with a wide range of individual outcomes, such as follower job satisfaction and satisfaction with the leader, perceptions of leader effectiveness, follower motivation, as well as a significant negative relationship with voluntary turnover and absenteeism (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Transformational leadership is also related to a substantial increase in group/organization performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996) and the strength of organizational climates (e.g., Richardson & Vandenberg, 2005; Zohar & Tenne-Gazit, 2008). Moreover, three studies have recently demonstrated the positive moderating effects of transformational leadership on the relationship between age and/ or

functional diversity with group processes (e.g. creativity, creative efficacy, group potency) and performance (Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Kunze & Bruch, 2010; Shin & Zhou, 2007).

Although much attention has been given to the outcomes of transformational leadership, much less has been paid to *how* they have these effects and even more so, how these mechanisms may operate in different social contexts (Shamir & Howell, 1999; Yukl, 1999). Recent efforts to understand the influence process of transformational leadership suggests that their influence on followers' social identification with the organization is a primary explanatory mechanism.

Mechanism of Social Influence: Organizational Identification

Organizational identification can be broadly defined as the merging of the organization into employees' self-concepts and the experience of belonging (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Mael & Ashforth, 1992), together with the alignment of individual and organizational values and the motivation to engage in behavior consistent with the organization's best interests (e.g., Ashforth, Harrison, Corley, 2008). Organizational identification can also be conceptualized as a mechanism of social influence and attitude change (Kelman, 1958; 1961; O'Reilly III & Chatman, 1986), whereby individuals conform to expected behaviors in order to have a meaningful, self-defining relationship with a group (i.e., identification; Kelman, 1958; 1961) and because the content of the behavior is congruent with their value-system (i.e., internalization; Kelman, 1958; 1961).

In general, research suggests that when individuals identify with their organization, they tend to behave according to organizational norms and values (Ashforth et al., 2008; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). Organizational identification is related to decreased turnover and absenteeism (O'Reilly III & Chatman, 1986; Riketta, 2005), higher job and organization satisfaction (Riketta, 2005), higher work-group and occupational attachment

(Riketta, 2005), higher affective organizational commitment (Riketta, 2005), increased provision of social support and helping behaviors (Haslam, O'brien, Jetten, Vormedal, & Penna, 2005; Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005), higher job motivation (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000), increased task performance (Riketta, 2005), and more extra-role behaviors (O'Reilly III & Chatman, 1986; Riketta, 2005; van Dick, Grojean, Christ, & Wieseke, 2006).

In the context of intergroup relations, an organizational identity also represents a superordinate identity or a common in-group that motivates subgroup members to perceive themselves as part of a shared collective and to recognize their common goals (c.f., Gaertner, Dovidio, Anstasio Bachman, & Rust,). In turn, increasing the salience of superordinate identification is thought to reduce intergroup biases and facilitate cooperation because in-group benefits are now afforded to former out-group members (Gaertner et al., 1993; Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1996; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a). Consistent with this view, diversity scholars have argued that organizations that make organizational membership salient will best elicit the benefits of diversity (Chatman & Flynn, 2001; Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neal, 1998). Research has supported that collective identification mitigates the negative effects of diversity on social interactions and conflict (Chatman et al., 1998), as well as productivity and perceived creativity (Chatman et al., 1998), team learning (van der Vegt & Bunderson, 2005), and team performance (Kearney & Gebert, 2009; van der Vegt & Bunderson, 2005). Therefore, by fostering an organizational identity, transformational leaders may be able to minimize intergroup conflicts that lead to social discrimination against minorities' while promoting their perceptions of belonging and the ability to leverage their perspectives for the benefit of the collective.

Transformational Leadership & Organizational Identification. Integrating on Shamir et al.'s (1993) self-concept based motivational theory of charismatic leadership and Lord et al.'s (1999) self-concept based theory of leadership, Kark and Shamir (2002) outline the mechanisms that facilitate transformational leaders' influence on followers' organizational identification. Transformational leaders are argued to increase the salience of an organization's identity by distinguishing it from others and creating a desirable organizational image (Kark & Shamir, 2002; Shamir et al., 1993). In addition, transformational leaders are argued to leverage their idealized influence and inspirational motivation, to provide an attractive vision based on shared ideologies that link organizational goals to followers' self-concepts (Kark & Shamir, 2002). This is critical as establishing an organization's identity, or its enduring characteristics including missions or goals, is a prerequisite for organizational identification by employees (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000).

Furthermore, when organizational identification is made salient, followers will interact with transformational leaders as prototypical members of the organization that exemplify its goals and values. Transformational leaders communication style is important, as they may also use the "assumed or transcendent we" strategy (c.f., Cheney, 1983), such that they will refer to all followers as "we" to influence how followers define themselves and highlight followers' membership in the organization (Kark & Shamir, 2002). Through more interpersonal behaviors (e.g., individual consideration and intellectual stimulation), transformational leaders can appeal to followers' individual needs and create a perception that the organization is developmental and supportive of their potential, as well as fostering followers' perceptions of involvement, cohesion, and trust (Kark & Shamir, 2002). This is critical because perceived organizational support and perceptions of organizational fairness are also predictive of employees'

organizational identification, such that when employees believe that their organization is concerned with their well-being and they have high social status, they are more likely to develop psychological attachment to the organization (De Cremer, 2006; Edwards & Peccei, 2010; Tyler & Blader, 2003).

Indeed, empirical research supports that social identification with the organization explains the influence of transformational leadership on followers' self-concepts, conceptualized as self-efficacy, collective-efficacy, and organization based self-esteem (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003), as well as follower motivation and performance (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Walumbwa, Avolio, & Zhu, 2008; Kark & Shamir, 2002). Researchers have also found that the self-concordance of organizational values (Bono & Judge, 2003) and person-organization value congruence (Hoffman, Bynum, Piccolo, & Sutton, 2011) also help to explain the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's supervisor, organizational commitment, and unit effectiveness. Moreover, Kearney and Gebert (2009) recently supported that transformational leaders buffered the negative effects of age and/or functional diversity on followers' collective identification, which in turn was positively related to group performance. Consistent with this existing research, researchers have generally assumed that transformational leadership behaviors are positively related to minority followers' organizational identification.

An alternative Explanation: In-group Projection & Minority Compliance

Importantly, efforts to change group categorizations via a superordinate identity are not without complications when subgroup identities are valued, and they even have the potential to exacerbate social discrimination against minorities (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). When a superordinate identity is imposed, dominant and minority group members will both be regarded

positively to the extent that they reflect the new prototype of this group (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007). Unfortunately, organizational prototypes are still based on their salient characteristics that can serve as the basis for subgroup comparisons, and as discussed, "organizations are a crucible in which wider intergroup relations, often evaluatively polarized and emotionally charged, are played out; conflict, disadvantage, marginalization, and minority victimization can arise" (Hogg & Terry, 2000, p. 132).

Consequentially, in-group projection can occur, such that the dominant group can proclaim that their distinct attributes exhibit greater prototypically for the superordinate group than those of minorities; thus, retaining their justification for entitlement to higher status and privilege (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel et al., 2007). By contrast, characteristics of minorities will be perceived as less prototypical and embracing aspects of their identity that conflict with the prototype will be viewed as deviance (Waldzus, Mummendey & Wenzel, 2005; Wenzel et al., 2007), legitimizing social discrimination against minorities (Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003; Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004). As a result, treatment of minorities as an in-group member is contingent upon their acceptance of the exclusionary prototype by not arguing any power differentials as discriminatory and conforming (Brickson, 2000; Wenzel et al., 2007). Unfortunately, organizations that unilaterally pressure minorities to conform on factors that are unrelated to job performance, but important to their self-concept (e.g., displaying an appearance, behaviors, or views that are consistent with their racial-ethnic group), are perceived as threatening (Brickson, 2000; Cox & Blake, 1991; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). In an effort to navigate the discrepancy between personal values rooted in their social identity and the dominant values of the organization, while mitigating the threat of persistent

workplace exclusion, minorities may engage in behaviors to comply with pressures to conform (Hewlin, 2003, 2009).

Compliance is a specific type of conformity whereby individuals openly accept dominant beliefs, yet rather than internalizing dominant values, they instead suppress the expression of conflicting personal values in order to achieve social approval (Kelman, 1958; 1961). Conformity research suggests that when an individual's group affiliation or self-esteem are threatened by the potential or actuality of not being accepted, they are driven to restore their sense of belonging and will engage in behaviors that increase interpersonal attraction by others, including compliance to accepted social norms (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Kelman, 1958; 1961). Aligned with this perspective, SIT related research suggests that members of devalued groups, or individuals with high levels of distinctiveness within social groups, are motivated to affiliate with the dominant group in order to enhance their social status, suppressing aspects of their identity and conforming to dominant social norms (Brewer, 1991; Hewlin, 2003; Roberts, 2005; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Consistent with these views, scholars have suggested that minorities will cope with social exclusion in the workplace by strategically enacting their social identity in order to minimize disparate treatment (Hewlin, 2003, 2009; Roberts, 2005; Roberts et al., 2008).

Integrating these perspectives, Hewlin (2003) operationalized compliance behaviors involving the suppression of social identity based values in the workplace as *façades of conformity*, or emotional displays, behaviors, and verbal statements that attempt to convey organizational values (i.e., modeling behaviors after dominant group members, wearing proper attire, or expressing agreement with others). This construct is very similar to Cross and Strauss (1998) concept of "code-switching", or turning off attributes and behaviors associated with

group membership in response of contextual demands in order to achieve identity fit.   Previous research has documented that minorities report having to wear a mask by not expressing diverse viewpoints or unique aspects of their culture (e.g., clothing or hair, displaying cultural artifacts) in order to increase the comfort and attraction of other employees while avoiding exacerbated disparate treatment and social isolation (e.g., Cox, 1994; Roberts, 2005). Minorities have also reported feeling like they are judged more on their ability to conform rather than on their performance (Cox & Nkomo, 1986), or that they gain more positive job-related outcomes when they display behavior of the dominant group compared to when they do not (Roberts, 2005). Cross and Strauss (1998) found that minorities that engaged in "code-switching" by using more formal language around dominant group members will make dominant group members more comfortable, thereby minimizing prejudice., and Hewlin (2009) supported that minority status is related to creating a façade of conformity, specifically.

Importantly, while both minorities' identification and compliance will facilitate the comfort of dominant group members and intergroup relations because the resulting behaviors of minorities will appear the same to leaders and coworkers, the underlying psychological processes differ (Kelman, 1958; 1961) and have divergent ramifications for psychological attachment to the organization (O'Reilly III & Chatman, 1986) and followers' psychological well-being (Roberts, 2005). Minorities who engage in compliance behavior are readily aware of their devalued status and the inability to be authentic in the workplace (Roberts, 2005; Roberts & Roberts, 2007). As such, compliance behaviors are related to decreased psychological attachment to the organization (i.e., turnover, intent to turnover, extra-role behaviors, satisfaction; Cox, 1991; O'Reilly III & Chatman, 1986) and less work engagement (Kahn, 1990). Creating a façade of conformity is also harmful to minorities' psychological well-being, leading

to higher ambivalence and stress (Bell, 1990; Bell & Nkomo, 2001), emotional exhaustion (Hewlin, 2009), and decreased self-esteem (Steele and Aronson, 1995). Furthermore, scholars recognize that even a unifying superordinate group may undermine the potential for leveraging diversity by encouraging conformity rather than verifying the social views of their group members and encouraging them to apply their differences to collective performance goals (Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002; Polzer, Swann, & Milton 2003; Swann, Kwan, Polzer, & Milton (2003); Swann, Polzer, Seyele, & Jin Ko, 2004), hampering minorities' performance (e.g., creativity and critical thinking) or contribution to group tasks (Brickson, 2000; Kahn, 1990; Roberts, 2005; Roberts & Roberts, 2007).

   Transformational Leadership & Minority Compliance. Researchers have generally assumed that the vision of transformational leaders will be in the best interest of all followers (Yukl, 1999); however, it is possible for the vision that is conveyed to not be maximally beneficial for the entire organization, such that they may be polarizing or conflicting with some followers personality, demographics, or values (c.f., Beyer, 1999; House & Howell, 1992; Sosik & Dinger, 2007; Stam, Van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010). According to Shamir and Howell (1999), transformational leaders' ability to shape the values of the superordinate group may be restricted, such that transformational leadership is more effective when they are consistent with the dominant social values of the organization. Due to the persistence of racial inequalities in the workplace, transformational leaders that espouse dominant social values may facilitate the projection of white norms onto the organizational prototype.

   In this context, efforts to impose a superordinate identity will be consistent with the devaluation of minorities and minority conformity (c.f., Greer et al., 2012; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). Minority individuals that value their racial-ethnic identity are likely to perceive a

discrepancy between their personal values and those touted by the transformational leader, yet they may feel pressure to conform to the superordinate organizational identity in order to reduce the experience of social exclusion (Brickson, 2000; Cox, 1994; Hewlin, 2003, 2009; Roberts, 2005; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005). Under these conditions, minorities would perceive that their choice of behavior is limited and the mechanism used by transformational leadership to enact social influence on minority followers and facilitate the effectiveness of diverse groups would shift from organizational identification and value internalization to compliance via façades of conformity (c.f., Hewlin, 2003, 2009; Kelman, 1958, 1961). Thus, we aim to explore how and under what conditions does transformational leadership foster minorities' organizational identification and minimize in-group projection that leads to façades of conformity.

The Role of Diversity Management Ideology.

We have suggested that the effectiveness of transformational leadership in diverse groups or organizations can be explained by their fostering of organizational identification and an alternative mechanism of minority compliance via façades of conformity. This raises the question of what determines if transformational leadership behaviors foster minorities' organizational identification and their perceptions of belonging instead of dominant-group projection and pressure for minorities to conform to oppressive organizational norms. According to Wenzel et al. (2007), whether efforts to promote collective identification with a superordinate group are successful in creating a common in-group shared by all or lead to in-group projection that perpetuates existing hierarchies among subgroups depends on "different mediating processes that are not mutually exclusive and can operate simultaneously" (p. 355). Thus, it is imperative to unravel the underlying processes whereby transformational leadership attempts to foster collective identification in the context of managing diversity.

In the context of racial-ethnic diversity management, evidence suggests that diversity ideologies that encompass different modes of acculturation and strategies to reduce intergroup prejudice may represent these processes. Existing theoretical discussions of transformational leadership and diversity or identity conflict management present conflicting arguments for the underlying diversity ideology of transformational leadership behaviors. On the one hand, it has been argued that transformational leaders achieve collective identification in diverse groups through the *recategorization* of subgroup members with a superordinate identity and downplaying subgroup membership, which is aligned with *colorblind* perspectives for managing racial-ethnic differences. By contrast, others have argued transformational leaders are effective through *subcategorization,* or facilitating the dual identification with both one's subgroup and the collective, which is consistent with the *multicultural* approach to managing racial-ethnic diversity. Notably, we aimed to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and both strategies simultaneously, as they are argued to coexist within work units and have been shown to represent distinct constructs (Larkey, 1999; Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009).

Transformational Leadership & Colorblind Diversity Management

Colorblindness, the dominant ideology for managing workplace diversity and fostering collective identification (Stevens et al, 2008; Thomas & Ely, 1996), is based on the American ideals of meritocracy, assimilation, equality, and individualism (Apfelbaum, Norton, & Sommers, 2012; Markus, Steele, & Steele, 2000; Stevens et al, 2008; Thomas et al., 2004). This approach stresses that people are generally similar, leading to the argument that racial-ethnic differences do not matter in decision making and should be minimized or ignored (Markus et al., 2000; Stevens et al, 2008). Colorblindness is equivalent to the recategorization strategy for minimizing group biases when racial-ethnic differences are of concern, such that it aims to

reduce intergroup bias by encouraging subgroups to emphasize their similarities and the suppression of (albeit not extermination of) differences, leading them to recategorize themselves as members of a single, fully inclusive group (Stevens et al., 2008; Thomas & Chrobot, Mason, 2005). Underlying this notion is that if racial-ethnic differences are not noticed, then they cannot lead to biases and discrimination and thus, will not lead to intergroup conflict that undermines performance. Moreover, because differences are thought to be the source of social categorizations (Turner et al., 1987) whereas similarities are thought to enhance interpersonal attraction (Byrne, 1971), enhancing perceived similarities is thought to increase the likelihood that diverse individuals will be able to self-categorize and categorize others as members of the same unifying group (Stevens et al., 2008).

Several scholars have argued that transformational leaders employ a colorblind or recategorization strategy to enhance collective identification and the desire to pursue collective goals among diverse followers (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2007; Pittinsky, 2010; Pittinsky & Simon, 2007). Through inspirational motivation and idealized consideration, transformational leaders will attempt compensate for followers' differences by providing an inspiring vision that is desirable for all groups and reconciles followers' personal goals with the goals of the collective. However, these authors suggest that transformational leadership behaviors focus on bringing together diverse individuals (overlooking subgroup interactions) by *replacing* their subgroup identities with a superordinate identity in order to minimize the negative effects of categorizations while promoting engaged behavior towards collective goals (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2007; Pittinsky, 2010; c.f. Greer et al., 2012).

Greer et al (2012) specifically argue that visionary leaders that emphasize a superordinate identity while minimizing the acknowledgement of differences will be the ones best able to

facilitate intergroup communication, as acknowledging differences will enhance the emergence

of social categorizations. Kunze and Bruch (2010) also suggest that transformational leaders

managing diversity will create a common identity that promotes all to act uniformly. In their

discussion of transformational leadership and followers' identification, Kark and Shamir (2002)

also explain that transformational leaders highlight the similarity among workers, as well as

between themselves and workers, in order to enhance a sense of unity and inhibit the salience of

subordinate identities. Moreover, transformational leaders are also argued to espouse universal

values of equality to encourage one to embrace the same treatment for all and transcend their

self-interests (Goethals, 2005; Pittinsky, 2010).

Taken together, these discussions suggest that transformational leadership behaviors are

a mechanism to promote a colorblindness in the workplace because they would focus on shifting

attention away from racial-ethnic differences towards similarities in an effort to foster a common

organizational identity. Through this organizational identity, transformational leaders are argued

to promote cohesion and perceptions of inclusion because all followers are now considered

members of one in-group. Consistent with this view, we hypothesized the following:

> *H1: Transformational leadership behaviors will be positively related to minority*
>
> *followers' perceptions of organizational colorblindness.*

Minority Identification & Compliance under Colorblindness

Evidence supports that colorblindness is a myth, as ignoring racial ethnic differences is

prevented by the fast, automatic process of race perception (Afelbaum, Norton, & Sommers,

2012; Ito & Urland, 2003; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005; Thomas et al., 2004). Moreover,

while social identities may lead to conflicts or prejudice, they also represent important aspects of

the self-concept. As a result, racial-ethnic subgroup members may view attempts by leaders to

absorb their groups into a larger collective as illegitimate or threatening to their personally valuable subgroup identities and any positive intergroup effects are not likely to be sustained (Hewstone & Brown; 1986; Hornesy & Hogg, 2000c; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Van Knippenberg et al., 2004).   Ultimately, these dynamics have negative consequences for the experience of minorities in the workplace.

Efforts to recategorize all racial-ethnic groups as the same may be perceived as threatening to the status of whites in organizations as the prototypical subgroup, motivating them to reestablish and legitimize their distinctiveness from minorities through increased in-group favoritism and minority derogation (i.e., Brickson, 2000; Hornesy & Hogg, 2000a; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b; Hornesy & Hogg, 2000c; Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Outten, Schmitt, Miller, & Garcia, 2012). Indeed, when primed with colorblind ideologies or collective identity orientations, whites exhibit increased racial biases and behavioral prejudice (Holoien & Shelton, 2011; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Vorauer, Gagnon, & Sasaki, 2009; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000), as well as less support for diversity friendly practices (Wolsko et al., 2006) and a lack of motivation to invest in interpersonal relationships with minorities (Brickson, 2000; Mummedey & Wenzel, 1999; Stevens et al., 2008). Poteat and Spanierman (2012) also supported that colorblindness mediates the relationship between whites' support for existing racial hierarchies (i.e., orientation towards social dominance) and modern racist attitudes.

Furthermore, whites' efforts to appear colorblind results in the persistence of race and ethnicity in whites' decision making under the guise of alternative criteria (c.f., Norton, Vandello, Biga, & Darley, 2008; Norton, Vandello, & Darley, 2004), as well as perceptions of legitimate reasons to discriminate (c.f., Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000; Thomas et al., 2004) and a failure to identify explicit instances of discrimination (Apfelbaum, Pauker,

Sommers, & Ambady, 2010). Moreover, during interpersonal interactions where whites attempt to appear colorblind, they are more likely to make less eye contact and appear less friendly to minorities (Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006). Minorities also tend to view interactions with whites that avoid acknowledging race as more biased than those that openly talk about it (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008) and colorblindness as a way to ignore the systematic oppression faced by minority group members (Bonilla-Silva, 2003).

Thus, as Knowles and colleagues (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009) found, while colorblindness may be interpreted as a way to reduce discrepancies between group outcomes by providing an all-inclusive identity group, it can also function as a legitimizing ideology for the status quo that enables dominant in-group projection to occur. This allows whites to identify with organizations that embrace colorblindness because it is perceived as inclusive of their group (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011) and is associated with evaluative bias in favor of whites (Wolsko et al. 2006); however, this strategy does not adequately lead to prejudice reduction and allows for a culture of racism to persist (Apfelbaum et al, 2010; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Stevens, et al., 2008; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005).

Consequentially, colorblindness places a pressure on minorities to conform to white-defined organizational norms in order to be considered as legitimate members of the superordinate group (Brickson, 2000; Hewlin, 2003, 2009; Roberts, 2005; Stevens et al., 2008) and reinforces minorities' perceptions that the organization is exclusionary or unwilling to truly integrate them (Brickson, 2000). This leads to distrust of the organization and diversity initiatives, as well as psychological disengagement from the organization as the source of their devaluation (Brickson, 2000; Cox & Blake, 1991; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Padilla & Perez, 2003; Kahn, 1990). Whites' colorblindness has also been shown to predict minorities'

disengagement at work (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009) and their cognitive depletion indirectly through prejudice (Holoien & Shelton, 2011).

Therefore, we expected that colorblindness will undermine the development of minorities' ability to self-categorize as a valued member of the organization and to be authentic in the workplace, negatively impacting their organizational identification. Instead, the threat of perpetuated discrimination under colorblind diversity management will increase efforts to comply with organizational pressures to conform. Consistent with this view, we expected the following:

> *H2: Organizational colorblindness will be negatively related to minorities'*
> *organizational identification.*

> *H3: Organizational colorblindness will be positively related to minorities' façades*
> *of conformity.*

> *H4: Colorblindness will partially mediate the relationship between*
> *transformational leadership and a) minority followers' organizational identification*
> *and b) minority followers' façades of conformity.*

Transformational Leadership & Multicultural Diversity Management

As a result of the shortcomings of recategorization and colorblind efforts, scholars have concluded that minimizing threats to subgroup distinctiveness is a prerequisite for harmonious subgroup interactions and leader-follower relations (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Wenzel et al., 2007). Multiculturalism entails recognizing cultural differences and valuing them as a resource for new perspectives that can be leveraged for organizational growth (Cox & Blake, 1991; Thomas & Ely, 1996). Proponents of this perspective profess that racial-ethnic differences should be the foundation for mutual respect because some social identities are critical to the self -

concept, as such "trying to submerge those identities into a superordinate identity can be counterproductive or impossible" (Pittinsky, 2010; p. 197). Brewer (1991) explains that within social groups, individuals have psychological needs for both belonging *and* differentiation, motivating them to identify with social groups that offer the best balance between belonging to a larger collective and still feeling distinguished based on their other identities. Embracing this view, multiculturalism takes the subcategorization approach to fostering organizational identity, affirming the positive distinctiveness of one's racial-ethnic group membership while extending the benefits of in-group membership to all employees (e.g., Cox, 1991*;* Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Shore et al., 2011; Stevens et al., 2008; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2005*).* That is, valuing diversity is thought to promote the formation of a collective identity where appreciating differences is the basis of a shared identity made of different but complementary parts that need not suppress unique aspects of its members to achieve cohesion (Jans, Postmes, & Van der Zee, 2012; Postmes, Haslam & Swaab, 2005; Postmes, Spears, Lee, & Novak, 2005; Rink & Ellemers, 2007; Wenzel et al., 2007).

An emerging body of literature suggests that transformational leaders may employ a multicultural approach to diversity management. This alternative perspective is argued by Shin and Zhou (2007) and Kearney and Gebert (2009) who suggest that transformational leadership promotes sub-categorization among diverse followers. Consistent with the colorblind perspective, transformational leaders will be able to create and foster followers' identification with a superordinate collective identity by instilling the belief that identification will promote followers' self-concepts through idealized influence and inspirational motivation. By contrast, the subcategorization perspective argues that by expressing the advantages of diversity for group performance in their vision, transformational leaders will reduce stress or uncertainty related to

diversity and will encourage followers to leverage their diversity and work through dissent instead of letting it become a barrier (Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Shin & Zhou, 2007). Intellectual stimulation allows transformational leaders to highlight the importance of taking advantage of availability of diverse knowledge and perspectives to discover new approaches and ideas by listening to perspectives that differ from the norm. Lastly, through individualized consideration, transformational leaders will ensure all followers feel that their needs are heard and that individual expression is encouraged, ensuring that followers perceive that their unique backgrounds are valued and reinforced (Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Shin & Zhou, 2007). Aligned with these arguments, we expected the following:

H5: Transformational leadership behaviors will be positively related to minority followers' organizational multiculturalism.

Minority Identification & Compliance under Multiculturalism

Huo and colleagues support that while followers have more favorable reactions to authority under identification with a superordinate identity compared to subgroup identification alone (Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind, 1996), this requires that identities different from the authority figure (subgroup identities) are still acknowledged (Huo, Molina, Sawahata, & Deang, 2004). Social categorization research also supported that when the prototype of a superordinate group is complex so that it cannot be embodied by a particular subgroup or when it is represented by several prototypes, in-group projection is less likely to occur and all have the potential to self-categorize as a member of the group (Waldzus et al., 2005; Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004; Wenzel et al., 2007). Moreover, efforts to impose a superordinate identity while preserving subgroup membership is also related to minimized perceptions of threat and out-group bias, allowing superordinate identities to facilitate positive intergroup and motivational outcomes

(Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000c; Hogg & Terry, 2000). This pattern of results is also observed when using the multicultural approach to managing racial-ethnic diversity.

Dominant group members that endorse multiculturalism demonstrate less prejudice towards racial-ethnic minorities (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Verkuyten, 2005; Wolsko et al., 2000), less ethnocentrism (Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007), and more positive evaluations of both racial-ethnic minorities and diversity initiatives (Simmons, Wittig, & Grant, 2010; Verkuyten, 2005; Wolsko et al., 2006) compared to those that endorse colorblindness. This may be because individuals that endorse multiculturalism are also more perceptive of social discrimination against minorities (Verkuyten & Matinovic, 2005). Furthermore, multiculturalism has been shown to have a reciprocal relationship with increased effort toward trying to see an argument from another perspective (Todd & Galinsky, 2012), which is associated with accepting the similarities and differences among people (Todd & Galinsky, 2012), more positive out-group attitudes (Bruneau & Saxe, 2012), less denial of intergroup discrimination (Todd, Bodenhausen, & Galinsky, 2011), weaker stereotype maintenance (Todd, Galinsky, & Bodenhausen, 2012), and fewer automatic expressions of racial bias (Todd, Bodenhausen, Richeson, & Galinsky, 2011) by dominant group members. Thus, while multiculturalism may be associated with the activation of more categorizations due to recognizing differences, this occurs without necessarily translating to negative attitudes toward out-group members (Ryan, Casas, & Thompson,2010; Wolsko et al., 2000), making it a promising solution to minimizing intergroup biases and in-group-projection by dominant group members.

Emerging research confirms that valuing diversity is positively related to organizational identification amongst all followers despite perceived differences (Luijters et al., 2008; van Dick et al., 2008; van Knippenberg et al., 2007; Swann et al., 2000), as well as perceptions that it is safe for all to share and leverage their diverse perspectives to contribute to collective aims (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Foldy, Rivard, & Buckley, 2008; Homan, Van Knippenberg, Van Kleef, & De Dreu, 2007; Polzer et al., 2002; Thomas & Ely, 1996; van Dick et al., 2008). Minorities are particularly likely to endorse multicultural ideals (Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010; Ryan et al., 2007; Wolsko et al., 2006; Verkuyten, 2005) and organizations that embrace dual identification (e.g., Luijters, van der Zee, & Otten, 2006) because they affirm minorities' racial-ethnic groups as being both present and different (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2006; Stevens et al., 2008; Verkuyten, 2005), as well as valuable to organizational effectiveness (Thomas & Ely, 1996; Ely & Thomas, 2001). Whites' multiculturalism also predicts psychological engagement among their minority peers (Plaut et al., 2009). Moreover, when multicultural initiatives are successfully framed in a way where all racial-ethnic groups are acknowledged and whites feel included in diversity efforts, they too are more likely to associate multiculturalism with the self and to endorse these initiatives (Plaut et al., 2011).

It is important to note that pluralistic diversity initiatives often fail because they are inappropriately framed as differentiation alone (Shore et al., 2011) or as benefitting minorities only (Verkuyten, 2005), leading to majority group members' resistance (Stevens et al., 2008). This stems from majority group perceptions that they are overlooked or excluded by multicultural initiatives (Plaut et al. 2011; Stevens et al., 2008; Wolsko et al., 2006), producing an identity threat that exacerbates negative out-group attitudes and discriminatory behaviors (Correll, Park, & Smith, 2008; Thomas & Plaut, 2008). In addition, when diversity initiatives

focus on differentiation alone, minorities often feel exploited or not integrated in the broader organizational goals, perpetuating their perceptions of exclusion (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Thomas & Ely, 1996).   Multiculturalism is only achieved when differences are acknowledged and integrated into the organization's values with normative support for diversity, promoting dual identification with the organization and one's subgroup (Hogg & Terry, 2000).

In sum, multiculturalism or valuing diversity can become a self-esteem enhancing aspect of the organizational group (van Knippenberg et al., 2007), allowing *all* group members to feel like they can identify with the organization while reducing identity threats by meeting their needs for positive distinctiveness (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Shore et al., 2011).   As a result, harmonious intergroup relations can be achieved and   minorities are no longer pressured to conform because they can embrace their unique cultural background at work without fear of social isolation or discrimination, motivating them to leverage their unique perspectives for the benefit of the group (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Ely & Thomas, 2001).   Aligned with this view, we expected multiculturalism to be associated with minorities' organizational identification and decreased efforts by minorities to create a façade of conformity.

> *H6: Organizational multiculturalism will be positively related to minorities' organizational identification.*

> *H7: Organizational multiculturalism will be negatively related to minorities' façades of conformity.*

> *H8:   Organizational multiculturalism will partially mediate the relationship between transformational leadership with high multicultural competence with a) minority followers' organizational identification and b) minority followers' façades of conformity.*

Importantly, the hypothesized behaviors of transformational leaders that acknowledge the value of diversity or emphasize similarity are assumed rather than examined in the reported research, as they are not explicitly incorporated into the construct of transformational leadership. Yukl (1996) explains that transformational leadership theory may omit important leadership behaviors and the consideration of different situational variables. Moreover, Kark and Shamir (2002) note that there are other behaviors that are related to effectively fostering of collective identification that are not specified in conceptualizations of transformational leadership. We argue that additional behaviors are necessary for transformational leaders to promote a multicultural ideology that leads to valuing diversity rather than colorblindness that suppresses differences—namely, multicultural competency.

The Moderating Role of Multicultural Competency

Multicultural competency is defined as the motivational (i.e. value orientation towards working with others), cognitive (i.e., knowledge and understanding), and behavioral skills related to working with individuals of different demographic or cultural backgrounds (Chen & van Velsor, 1996). Multicultural competence enables leaders to deal with tensions associated with cultural differences by avoiding an ethnocentric perspective and recognizing the value of cultural diversity (Canen & Canen, 2004; Canen & Canen, 2008; Thomas & Woodruff, 1999). Thomas (1996) explains how ignorance of privilege leads to ethnocentrism, which may undermine the ability of white managers to have effective intercultural interactions with minority subordinates; however, this can be mitigated by better understanding how minorities navigate their experience in the workplace. Moreover, these efforts will also help managers develop multiculturally competent subordinates, with implications for succession planning and the development of diversity friendly work environments.

We focus on observable behaviors that can be perceived and assessed by followers. Cox (2001) suggests leadership behaviors that foster a multicultural climate include intervening to stop discriminatory behaviors (e.g., racial slurs, offensive jokes), openly espousing support for diversity initiatives, seeking feedback on their diversity related behaviors, seeking informal contact with individuals of diverse backgrounds, mentoring individuals of diverse backgrounds, participating in diversity related activities, and addressing diversity related concerns or opportunities. Others theorize that role modeling through goal setting, interpersonal communication with followers concerning diversity, conflict management, and active involvement in diversity initiatives is critical for effective diversity management (Chrobot-Mason & Ruderman, 2004). Engaging in these behaviors requires that leaders be willing to challenge conventional learning, to challenge stereotyping associated with categorization, and to respect diverse group identities in order to build a climate of inclusion, while accepting responsibility for organizational effectiveness (Canen & Canes, 2008; Thomas & Woodruff, 1999).

Although some have argued that multicultural competency is a myth (Inceoglu & Bartram, 2012), suggesting that these behaviors are already encompassed within existing leadership frameworks including transformational leadership, this has typically been concluded in the context of global leadership (e.g., Gentry & Sparks, 2012). Discussions related to the management of domestic diversity has more often tended to view existing leadership theories as exclusive of acknowledging the diversity of followers and how to bring diverse subgroups together (Canen & Canen, 2008; Pittinsky, 2007; 2010). Therefore, we aimed to determine if exhibiting multicultural competency behaviors is an important factor in whether transformational leadership behaviors promote identification with a superordinate group while preserving and

promoting the value of distinct subgroup identities or minimizing differences in favor of emphasizing similarity.

> *H9: Leaders' multicultural competency will moderate the relationship between*
>
> *transformational leadership and organizational diversity ideology, such that:*
>
>> *a) The relationship between transformational leadership and to minority followers'*
>>
>> *perceptions of organizational colorblindness is stronger when leaders exhibit low*
>>
>> *multicultural competence.*
>>
>> *b) The relationship between transformational leadership and to minority followers'*
>>
>> *perceptions of organizational multiculturalism is stronger when leaders exhibit*
>>
>> *high multicultural competence.*

The Moderating Role of Racial-ethnic Identification

Importantly, categorization does not alone ensure that members of different racial-ethnic groups strongly *identify* with those groups. Racial-ethnic identification refers to the feeling of belonging to a particular racial or ethnic group and can be conceptualized as a continuum from low to high (Phinney, 1992). The more strongly individuals identify with their racial-ethnic group, the more that group is central to their self-concept and they define themselves based on the perception that they share a common racial background with and relate to a certain group (Cross, 1995; Helms, 1990; Phinney, 1990). Racial-ethnic identification influences individuals' attitudes and behaviors, including engagement in cultural behaviors and practices or how individuals see other groups. Minorities with low racial-ethnic identification have not explored their racial-ethnic identity and view their group through the lens of the dominant culture, idealizing whiteness or the dominant group with goals of conformity (Cross, 1995; Phinney, 1990). In comparison, minorities with high racial-ethnic identification have a clear sense of their

own race-ethnicity and have internalized a positive minority racial-ethnic identity (Cross, 1995;

Phinney, 1990).

Exploring how racial ethic identity influences the dynamics of the proposed relationships

is critical. First, Howell and Shamir (2005) argue that the role of the follower is critical in the

influence process of charismatic types of leadership, such that followers with high self-concept

clarity have a higher motivation for self-expression and will attach more importance to self-

consistency, therefore responding to leaders that link goals with behaviors related to their values.

Thus, racial-ethnic identification is likely to play a role in how minorities perceive and respond

to the vision of transformational leaders. Secondly, racial-ethnic identification influences how

minorities respond to different acculturation strategies, either pressure to minimize their unique

identity or to embrace those identities (Phinney, 1990). In addition, racial-ethnic identification

influences how individuals perceive social inequalities and respond to devaluation or threats to

their identity (Haslam & Reicher, 2006; Roberts et al., 2008). Chrobot-Mason and Thomas

(2002) argue that, as a result, racial-ethnic identity development is related to minorities'

perception of and experience in organizations with different levels of inclusion and integration of

cultural differences.

Minorities' Racial-ethnic Identification & Colorblindness. Neville, Coleman,

Falconer, and Holmes (2005) found that colorblindness is endorsed by those minorities who hold

beliefs that work against the best interests of their racial-ethnic group and legitimize the status

quo, likely characteristic of low identifying minorities (Levin, Sidanius, Rabinowitz, & Federico,

1998). Furthermore, because minorities with low ethnic identification do not gain self-esteem

from their racial-ethnic group (Doosje, Spears, & Ellemers, 2002; Ethier & Deaux, 1994), they

will be more willing to attempt to affiliate with a dominant group to alleviate the potential for

persistent discrimination (Doosje et al., 2002; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2000; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Roberts, 2005; Roberts et al., 2008).   As a result, colorblind diversity management potentially provides an avenue for low-identifying minorities to "fit in" with valued organizational members, making them able to identify with a colorblind organization (Chrobot-Mason & Thomas, 2002; Phinney, 1990).

In comparison, highly identified minorities are less tolerable of hierarchical racial dynamics, negative racial climates, and barriers to minority integration (Davison & Friedman, 1998; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Watts & Carter, 1991). Moreover, because of the importance of their racial-ethnic identity to their self-concept, when a highly identified minority comes in contact with a dominant majority group, they will not be willing to relinquish aspects of their identity to conform (Phinney, 1990). Because highly identified minorities gain self-esteem from their racial-ethnic group, they respond to devaluation by remaining identified with their groups (Doosje et al., 2002; Ethier & Deaux, 1994), resisting pressures to conform by affirming the value and positive distinctiveness of their often stigmatized group (e.g., Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Doosje et al 2002; Roberts, et al., 2008). Verkuyten (2010) found that ethnic self-esteem buffered the effects of assimilation pressures specifically on the wellbeing of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands.

Thus, Chrobot-Mason and Thomas (2002) argue that highly identified minorities may be more resistant to the emphasis on homogeneity, pressures to conform, and racial biases that are associated with colorblindness, finding these environments to be oppressive and unsatisfactory compared to low identifying counterparts.   Further, highly identified minorities will be less likely to respond to threats of discrimination and bias associated with colorblindness by attempting to conform. Consistent with this argument, we expected the following:

H10: Minority followers' racial-ethnic identification will moderate the relationship between organizational colorblindness and minority followers' organizational identification and façades of conformity, such that:

> *a) Higher racial-ethnic identification will strengthen the negative relationship between colorblindness and organizational identification.*
>
> *b) Higher racial-ethnic identification will attenuate the positive relationship between colorblindness and façades of conformity.*

Minorities' Racial-ethnic Identification & Multiculturalism. When highly identified minorities also identify with the dominant organizational group, this represents dual identification and a pluralistic integration of those identities (Luijters et al., 2006; Phinney, 1990), which is enabled by multiculturalism. Empirical evidence supports that higher racial-ethnic identification and collective self-esteem based on one's racial group is related to the endorsement of multicultural diversity management for minorities (Linnehan, Konrad, Reitman, Greenhalgh, & London, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten & Matinovic, 2005; Wolsko et al, 2006). Consistent with this view, Chrobot-Mason and Thomas (2002) suggested that highly identified minorities are energized by a multicultural organization because they will perceive that their personally valuable identities are affirmed by the organizational environment. By contrast, they argue that low identifying minorities may initially be uncomfortable by the visibility of race in these organizations and will actually desire "to be treated like everyone else" (Chrobot Mason & Thomas, 2002). Still, Chrobot Mason and Thomas (2002) suggest that this will be a beneficial experience for low-identifying minorities by encouraging them to examine the value of their racial-ethnic group, propelling their identity development and also making them more prepared to be a member of an organization with goals of leveraging diversity.

Taken together, we hypothesized that multiculturalism will be related to stronger organizational identification for highly identified minorities compared to their counterparts with low racial-ethnic identification. However, we expect no differences between groups in relation to creating a façade of conformity.

> *H11: Minority followers' racial-ethnic identification will moderate the relationship between organizational multiculturalism and minority followers' organizational identification and façades of conformity, such that higher racial-ethnic identification will bolster the positive relationship between multiculturalism and organizational identification.*

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

All survey instruments and procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board

of the University of Georgia.

Sampling Strategy

Because we were interested in the specific sample of minority employees across a variety

of organizations, we used a combination of chain-referral ("snowball") sampling and recruitment

through the Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk; www.MTurk.com).

Chain referral sampling entails obtaining participants through referrals made by initial

contacts that meet the inclusion criteria and know of others that share the necessary attributes for

the sample of interest (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981; Goodman, 1961). This form of sampling is

useful for reaching participants that are a part of a specific population that is difficult to access

(Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). Still, there are potential limitations to chain-referral sampling,

such that it is not random and one cannot ensure the representativeness of the population.

Moreover, there is the potential for sampling bias, such that initial contacts will have a strong

impact on who is contacted to be a participant in the study (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981).

MTurk is an online marketplace that allows researchers to posts human intelligence tasks

(HITs; i.e., surveys) onto the website that are completed by participants in exchange for

compensation that is paid upon the completion of each task. The amount of compensation is set

by the researcher and typically depends on the time it will take to complete the task (Barger,

Behrend, Sharek, & Sinar, 2011; Buhrmester et al., 2011). MTurk workers are required to be at

least18 years old and their identity is verified by Amazon (Amazon collects name, addresses, dates of birth, and social security numbers to verify the identities of all MTurk workers); yet, beyond this, they are anonymous and no individually identifiable information is available to researchers. The qualifications feature of MTurk will only allow us to limit prospective participants to a subset of the total Mturk workforce based on their location in the United States and the quality of their task performance.   Still, research supports that Mturk workers are primarily based in the United States and are demographically diverse in terms of nationality, race, gender, and age. Most Mturk workers have a bachelor's degree and there is equal representation of full-time, part-time, and unemployed workers (Buhrmester, Kwang, Gosling, 2011; Ipeirotis, 2010; Ross, Zaldivar, Irani, & Tomlinson, 2010).

MTurk has received growing attention and use in the I-O psychology field (Barger, Behrend, Sharek, & Sinar, 2011). Research evaluating the quality of samples and data obtained via MTurk supports that 1) samples obtained through MTurk are more representative for organizational studies than student samples (e.g., Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiebe, 2011; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010); 2) while monetary compensation is not irrelevant, motivation to participate and quality of data are not dependent on the amount of compensation (Behrend et al., 2011; Buhrmester et al., 2011); and 3) data have comparable quality to student, applicant, or other internet samples; Barger & Sinar, 2011; Behrend et al., 2011; Buhrmester et al., 2011; Paolacci et al., 2010).

Sample Characteristics.

Our sample consisted of 349 self-identifying racial-ethnic minority adults (18 years or older) that were employed full-time within the United States. Sixty-seven percent of participants (N=236) were recruited from chain referral sampling. Overall, participants were 55.9% Female,

38% Hispanic white with the next largest racial group being blacks (32%), and had an average age of approximately 34 years old. Participants were fairly educated, with 67% having at least a Bachelor's degree. Fifty-eight percent of participants had tenure of between one to five years at their current organization, and only 28% of participants held a management position. Participants were employed across a wide array of occupational fields, with the most common being business and financial (42%). Most participants indicated that the race of their current supervisor was non-Hispanic white (86.8%) and that their relationship was between 1 and 5 years long (50%), consistent with tenure. Moreover, the average perceived percent similarity in terms of race was reported to be 33.4%.

A comparison of sample demographics by source may be found in Table 1. While the chain-referral sample was predominantly female (68%) and Hispanic white (45.3%), the Mturk sample was predominantly Asian (37.2%) and Male (60.2%). These samples were, however, similar in age, education, and tenure with their organization.

Procedure

Chain-Referral Sampling. A recruitment e-mail was sent to prospective participants, containing the general purpose the study, the inclusion criteria used to identify participants, a link to participate in the online study (hosted by Qualtics.com), and a request to forward the e-mail along to other prospective participants. Therefore, to ensure effective chain referral sampling we distributed our survey to an array of initial contacts across organizations in different fields, as well as members of employee business resource groups and diversity related organizations. Prospective participants that accessed the link to the survey were met with a consent form that explained that survey responses are confidential and all individually identifiable information (e.g., IP addresses) will be separated from the data prior to data analyses.

Informed consent was obtained electronically by asking participants to indicate that they consent to the conditions of the study and are willing to participate. Once consent was granted, participants completed a demographic questionnaire. If they did not meet the criteria for inclusion, they were rerouted to the final page of the survey via skip logic in Qualtrics. If they did meet the criteria, the survey proceeded and they completed the survey measures. The final page provided participants with the opportunity to discard their responses. At the completion of the survey, all participants were thanked for their participation.

MTurk. The HIT for our survey was posted for Mturk workers in the United States that have successfully completed 85% of their tasks. Our task was listed with the stipulations that our task pays $0.10 for completing the demographic screen, with a $1.00 bonus for completing the full survey if they qualified. Eligible Mturk workers were then be able to accept our main HIT, where they were asked to access the external link to the survey and to provide their Mturk worker ID, a unique identifier provided by Mturk that cannot be linked to any identifying information, in Mturk and Qualtrics to ensure that they were compensated. Then, the Mturk workers were presented with the consent form and once consent was granted, participants completed the demographic screen, proceeding in the same fashion as participants obtained through chain-referral sampling. Importantly, all participants were able to withdraw from the survey at any time with no penalty or loss of benefits to which they were entitled.

Measures

All variables were examined at the individual level. While transformational leadership and organizational identification can be represented at the group level, we were not focused on examining individuals nested within the same leader or organization level. Rather, we are interested in the psychological processes of minority individuals involved in how

transformational leadership influences their perceptions of organizational diversity ideology and the origination of organizational identification rather than conformity (c.f., Kark et al., 2003). Complete measures can be referred to in Appendix A.

Transformational Leadership. Transformational leadership was measured with the 20-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire `form 5x-short` (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 2004). The validity of transformational leadership as measured by the MLQ has been well established (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996). The MLQ consists of four items measuring each dimension of transformational leadership: inspirational motivation (e.g., Articulates a compelling vision of the future.), idealized charisma attributed (e.g., Acts in ways that builds my respect.), idealized charisma behavior (e.g., Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.), intellectual stimulation (e.g., Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.), and individualized consideration (e.g., Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group). Participants were asked to evaluate how frequently their immediate supervisor engages in these behaviors on a 0 (not at all) to 4(frequently, if not always) scale.

Multicultural Competency. Multicultural competency was measured with 11 items pulled from Linnehan, Chrobot-Mason, and Konrad's (2006) measure of intentions to engage in behaviors related to diversity: confronting others that engage in biased behavior, seeking to better understand and work with members of other cultures at work, and including members of all demographic groups in activities. Participants were asked to evaluate how frequently their immediate supervisor engages in these behaviors on a 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*frequently, if not always*) Likert-type scale.

Organizational Identification. Organizational identification was assessed using the Mael and Ashforth (1992) six-item scale. Meta-analytic evidence supports that this is the

preferred scale for measuring organizational identification because it is most representative of the construct because it is grounded in social identity theory. Moreover, the validity and psychometric quality of organizational identification as assessed by this measure is supported (Riketta, 2005). Participants indicated the degree to which they agree with these statements on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

       Façade of Conformity. Efforts to create a façade of conformity were measured using Hewlin's (2009) six item scale. This measure captures the extent to which employees externally conform to organizational pressures to assimilate, without internalizing the norms and values of the organization. on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

       Multiculturalism. To measure the degree to which participants perceive their organization to be multicultural, we used a modified version of Luijters et al.'s (2008) six item measure of intercultural group climate. This measure gauged the degree to which differences are acknowledged, discussed, and integrated into organizational discussions or activities. We changed the referent from one's branch to one's organization. Participants responded on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

       Colorblindness. To measure the degree to which participants perceive their organization endorses colorblindness, we used a modified version of Larkey's (1999) three-item measure of colorblindness in work groups. We modified this scale to reflect perceived organizational colorblindness. Larkey (1999) reports an alpha of .68 for this scale, likey in part due to having few items. To improve the internal consistency of this measure, three additional items were modified and added from Levin et al. (2012) and Van Dick et al. (2008). Participants responded on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Racial-ethnic Identification. Roberts, Phinney, Masse, Chen, Roberts, and Romero's (1999) revision to Phinney's (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-R) was used to assess racial-ethnic identification. With the MEIM-R, racial identity operationalized as continuous construct from low to high racial identity, rather than in stages. Roberts et al (1999) indicated that the MEIM-R has two distinct but highly correlated factors: 1) affirmation, belonging, and commitment and 2) exploration and ethnic behaviors. This version of the MEIM has been widely adopted and measurement invariance has been sufficiently supported across racial-ethnic groups (Avery, Tonidandel, Thomas, Johnson, & Mack, 2007). Suggested scoring for this measure is typically the overall mean of items from both dimensions, or the overall mean of the distinct factors separately. Consistent with the hypotheses of this study, participants were asked to respond to the seven affirmation, belonging, and commitment items on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Control Variables. We also measured variables that prior research suggests might also influence our hypothesized relationships. While our focus was on minorities in white-dominated organizations, we measured perceived minority representation in the workplace as this has been shown to alter how minorities view different diversity ideologies (Purdie-Vaughs et al., 2008). This was measured with one-item asking participants to estimate the percentage of their organization that is of the same race. We also measured organizational efforts to support diversity (e.g., organizational policies or programs), which were measured by three items from Triana and Garcia (2009; $\alpha= .90$). In addition, consistent with research on intergroup biases in the workplace (e.g., Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Merritt, Ryan, Mack, Leeds, & Schmitt, 2010), we also measured demographics including organizational status (management vs. non-management), gender, and length of relationship with supervisor, and supervisor's dominant v. minority status.

Additional Demographics. We collected additional information about participants' age, race, ethnicity, tenure, employment status (full-time v. part-time), education, and occupational field to ensure that they meet the criteria for inclusion and to describe the general characteristics of our sample.

CHAPTER 3

DATA ANALYTIC STRATEGY

Coefficient alphas were calculated to evaluate internal consistency of our measures. Then, because several of our scales have not been widely validated and/or were modified for the current study, we evaluated the internal structure of each of our scales using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Lance & Vandenberg, 2002) performed in M*plus* (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2007). Measurement invariance was also examined to ensure that the source of our sample (chain-referral sampling v. Mturk) did not influence the psychometric properties of our scales and that these groups could be combined for analyses (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). Specifically, we evaluated configural invariance to determine whether the factor pattern matrix was the same across groups and metric invariance to determine if factor loadings were the same across groups.

Furthermore, before examining our model, it was necessary to evaluate the distinctiveness of multicultural competency from transformational leadership. Graen, Rowold, and Heinitz (2010) present discussions from leadership scholars that offer recommendations for how to effectively differentiate between different leadership constructs and examine whether followers can distinguish between them, suggesting that researchers should examine discriminant construct validity with intercorrelations and CFA, as well as discriminant or incremental structural relationships with outcomes of interest. We adhered to these recommendations in our efforts to evaluate whether leaders' multicultural competent behaviors were distinguished from

transformational leadership behaviors by minority followers and added value to understanding the role of transformational leadership in diversity management.

Next, several measurement models were examined to evaluate the distinctiveness of our scales. Because a full measurement model would not converge, we examined several additional, meaningful measurement models to evaluate the distinctiveness of 1) scales measuring diversity ideology, 2) scales measuring identity related constructs, 3) scales measuring leadership behavior and organizational ideology, and 4) scales measuring leadership behavior and identity related constructs.

Finally, we used the approaches outlined by Edwards and Lambert (2007) and Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes (2007) to test our hypotheses in M*plus* (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2007). These approaches integrate path analysis with moderated regression to facilitate the examination of moderation for each direct, indirect, and total effect specified in a mediated model using Aiken and West's (1991) principle of simple slopes (Tate, 1998). Consistent with these approaches, we tested for first and second stage moderated mediation, where different variables moderate the first and second stages. We then examined alternative, theoretically plausible models including a correlation only model and additional structural models to avoid confirmation bias and support our model as the best-fitting (Vandenberg & Grelle, 2009).

For all models, full information maximum likelihood (FIML) was employed to address missing data, which has been shown to be the most effective strategy for handling missing data in structural equation modeling (Enders & Bandalos, 2001). The fit of all CFA and structural equation models were evaluated using the following fit indices: (a) the chi-square goodness of fit test (χ^2), (b) the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), (c) the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI, Tucker & Lewis, 1973), (d) the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger,

1990), and (e) the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; Bentler, 1995). CFI and TLI

values greater than .90 indicate adequate fit, while values of .95 or above indicate good fit;

RMSEA values less than .08 and SRMR values less than .10 indicate acceptable fit, while

RMSEA values below .06 and SRMR values below .08 indicate good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999;

Lance & Vandenberg, 2002). We then examined whether factor loadings were statistically

significant.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and inter-correlations among study and control variables are reported in Table 2.

Internal Consistency and Factor Structure of Study Measures

Meta-analytic results support that the mean reliability of the MLQ (transformational leadership) to be .90 (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), and the coefficient alpha for these items in our sample was .96. CFA was also used to evaluate the factor structure of the MLQ in our current sample (Table 3). The five factor model of transformational leadership was not admissible because several latent factor correlations were greater than one. When collapsing dimensions to create a three factor model based on these correlations, the latent factor correlations between these dimensions ranged from .91 to .96. A two factor model improved fit, but the latent factor correlation between these dimensions was still .96. Because the average correlations among the scales of the MLQ are often considerably high, existing research typically treats the dimensions as a single factor (e.g., Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2000; Kearny & Gebert, 2009). A one factor model fit our data best, and a principal components analysis indicated that one factor accounted for 70% of the variance in transformational leadership. This factor structure demonstrated some support for measurement invariance between sources (Table 4); however, this may be confounded with the marginal fit of the overall model.

Consistent with findings from Linnehan et al. (2006), CFA supported that a three factor model of multicultural competency fit our data best compared to a one or two factor model

(Table 5). These factors represent 1) confronting others that engage in biased behavior (confront; 4 items), 2) seeking to better understand and work with members of other cultures at work (seek; 4 items), and 3) including members of all demographic groups in activities (include; 3 items). Thus, we treated these dimensions as separate scales in future analyses; however, they were *not* examined simultaneously due to their high intercorrelation. Adequate configural and metric invariance were demonstrated between sources (Table 4). Linnehan et al. (2006) reported that alphas for these scales range between .79-.86; but, in the current sample the alphas were .92, .85, and .90 for confront, seek, and include, respectively.

CFA supported that a one factor model of multiculturalism had sufficient fit to our data (χ^2 (9) =50.50, p<.05; CFI = .95, TLI = .92, RMSEA= .12, SRMR= .05), and both configural and metric invariance were supported across sample sources (Table 4). Luijters et al. (2008) reported an alpha of .84 for this scale, which was also found in our current sample. Our colorblindness scale, by contrast, required modification: In examining the internal consistency of these items, it was evident that removing the new item, "My organization believes that recognizing different ethnic backgrounds can be a recipe for trouble," would significantly improve the coefficient alpha of this measure. CFA also supported that this item had a negative factor loading on a one-factor model of colorblindness (χ^2 (9) =62.50, p<.05; CFI = .92, TLI = .86, RMSEA= .14, SRMR= .06). Thus, this item was removed from the overall measure, and a one factor model of colorblindness then reasonably fit our data (χ^2 (5) =34.9, p<.05; CFI = .95, TLI = .90, RMSEA= .14, SRMR= .04), with a coefficient alpha of .84.

Still, the factor loading for the item "My organization believes we should not acknowledge racial-ethnic difference because we are really all the same" was somewhat lower (.51) than the loadings for the other items in the scale (.70-.79). Moreover, metric invariance

across sources was not supported (Table 4), suggesting that factor loadings differed across sources. Reviewing the standardized factor loadings pointed to the item, "My organization believes we should not acknowledge racial-ethnic difference because we are really all the same," may be the source of the invariance. Modeling partial metric invariance by removing the constraint on that item lead to an improvement in model fit from the metric invariance model (Table 4).

As expected based on previous research, a one factor model of organizational identification sufficiently fit our data (χ^2 (9) =41.73, p<.05; CFI = .96, TLI = .94, RMSEA= .10, SRMR= .03). Both configural and metric measurement invariance between sample sources were also supported (Table 4). The coefficient alpha for this scale was .86, consistent with the average meta-analytic reliability found by Riketta (2005). Likewise, a one factor model of the affirmation, belonging, and commitment dimension of the MEIM-R had adequate fit to our data (χ^2 (14) =162.96, p<.05; CFI = .92, TLI = .89, RMSEA= .10, SRMR= .04), and both configural and metric invariance across sources was supported (Table 4). Roberts et al. (1999) found that the range of alphas for this dimension of the MEIM is .81 to .88, while a higher coefficient alpha of .94 was found in our sample.

Examining the internal consistency of the façade of conformity scale suggested that the coefficient alpha would show a meaningful increase by removing the item, "I don't "play politics" at work by pretending to embrace organizational values." Although CFA supported that a one factor model of the original scale had adequate fit (χ^2 (9) =33.69, p<.05; CFI = .95, TLI = .92, RMSEA= .09, SRMR= .04; AIC= 5852.62, BIC= 5921.86), the standardized factor loading for the problematic item was particularly low (.16) is comparison to those for the other items (.53-.84). Removing this item from the model resulted in a better fitting model according

to the smaller Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) (χ^2 (9) =33.69, p<.05; CFI = .95, TLI = .90, RMSEA= .12, SRMR= .04; AIC= 4821.17, BIC= 4878.87). Thus, a five item scale was used for future analyses. Configural and metric measurement invariance between sample sources were both supported (Table 4). Hewlin (2009) reported an alpha of .83 for the original scale; however, with the modification, the coefficient alpha in our sample was .78.

Distinctiveness of Leadership Behaviors

Table 6 presents the latent factor correlations between the five dimensions of transformational leadership and the three dimensions of multicultural competency. These suggest that the correlations among the dimensions of transformational leadership are far larger than the correlations between these dimensions and multicultural competency. Still, the latent factor correlations between transformational leadership and the three dimensions of multicultural competency ranged from .55-.70, suggesting that transformational leadership has a large, positive correlation with the dimensions of multicultural competency. A series of CFAs supported that a four factor model of leadership behaviors fit our data best (Table 7). Specifically, the best fitting model included a transformational leadership factor and the three factors of multicultural competency. Models that attempted to collapse either multicultural competency dimension with transformational leadership resulted in a significant decrement in fit. Taken together, transformational leadership and multicultural competency may represent distinct yet highly related constructs when evaluated by minority followers. Discriminant structural relationships between these variables are explored further in our structural equation models, where each dimension of multicultural competency is examined as a first stage moderator.

Distinctiveness of Diversity Ideology Scales

Examining the correlation between our measures of diversity ideologies raised concerns about our measures. Previous research has found that colorblindness and multiculturalism are positively correlated yet distinct constructs (e.g., r = .21-.51; Ryan et al., 2007; r = .12, Larkey, 1999; r = -.38, Plaut et al., 2009); however, in our sample, the observed correlation between these variables was quite high (r = .70; latent factor correlation =.86). Therefore, additional analyses were conducted to examine the relationship among these scales.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the 11 items of both diversity ideology scales, suggesting that a 3 factor model of these items would fit our data best (χ^2 (25) =51.26, p<.05; CFI = .99, TLI = .97; RMSEA= .06, SRMR= .02). Examining these factor loadings suggested that these factors represented 1) viewing groups as the same and not acknowledging differences, 2) encouraging unity by treating group members as individuals or organization members rather than as members of a specific racial group, and 3) understanding and appreciating diversity. Factor loadings are reported in Table 8. A CFA confirmed that this model fit the data well (χ^2 (41) =139.41, p<.05; CFI = .94, TLI = .92; RMSEA= .08, SRMR= .05). The latent factor correlations among these factors ranged between .77-.78, thus, these factors were still all highly correlated. We should note that the original Larkey (1999) scale had a latent factor correlation of .85 with multiculturalism.

Taken together, it was concluded that consistent with the original hypotheses that proposed the effect of transformational leadership on minority followers' organizational identification and façades of conformity would be explained by the degree to which they encouraged the suppression of differences compared to the valuing and leveraging of differences, we determined it would be appropriate to retain the measure of multiculturalism as the primary

mediator in the model examined. Luijters et al. (2008) discuss that this scale was developed with

the expectation that it would represent the degree of value in diversity in intergroup contexts.

Thus, this scale may represent this particular distinction between colorblind and multicultural

organizational contexts.

Additional Measurement Models

CFA was used to evaluate the distinctiveness of our identity related constructs. A three

factor model of organizational identification, façades of conformity, and racial-ethnic

identification fit our data well (χ^2 (132) =394.19, p < .05; CFI = .92, TLI = .91; RMSEA= .08,

SRMR= .05).   Latent factor correlations between these dimensions ranged from -0.13 to .26.

Moreover, a two factor model of organizational identification and façades of conformity (χ^2 (43)

=130.66, p<.05; CFI = .94, TLI = .92; RMSEA= .08, SRMR= .05) fit better than a one factor

model (χ^2 (44) =573.84, p<.05; CFI = .62, TLI = .53; RMSEA= .19, SRMR= .15; $\Delta\chi^2$ (1) =

443.18, p<.05).

We also examined the distinctiveness of multicultural competence behaviors and

organizational multiculturalism. A four factor model of the three multicultural competency

dimensions and organizational multiculturalism fit our data well (χ^2 (113) =403.58, p<.05; CFI =

.93, TLI = .92; RMSEA= .08, SRMR= .06). Latent factor correlations between these dimensions

of multicultural competency and organizational multiculturalism ranged from .23 to .40. Finally,

a two factor model of transformational leadership and organizational identity (χ^2 (298) =977.55,

p<.05; CFI = .88, TLI = .88; RMSEA= .08, SRMR= .05) fit better than a one factor model (χ^2

(299) =1590.69, p<.05; CFI = .77, TLI = .75; RMSEA= .12, SRMR= .09; $\Delta\chi^2$ (1) = 613.14, p <.

.05).

Hypothesis Testing

To control for race, a separate criterion scaled race variable for each of our endogenous variables was created (c.f., Pedhazur, 1997). We used Mplus to compute composites, mean center our model variables, and create product terms while using FIML to account for missing data. These variables were saved into a new data file to be used in the test of our model hypotheses.

The Mediated Model. The mediation model specified the indirect effect of transformational leadership on minority followers' organizational identification and façades of conformity via perceptions of multiculturalism, as well as direct effects of transformational leadership on organizational identification and façades of conformity (Figure 2). This model also included control variables with meaningful relationships with variables in our model (i.e. race, gender, management status, relationship tenure, percent similarity, and organizational diversity management). This model fit our data well (χ^2 (7) = 4.03, p >.05; CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.06; RMSEA= .00, SRMR= .01), and parameter estimates are presented in Table 9. We should note that this partially model fit significantly better than a full mediation model (χ^2 (9) = 30.12, p <.05; CFI = .90, TLI = .67; RMSEA= .08, SRMR= .03; $\Delta\chi^2$ (2) = 26.09, p<.05).

We expected that transformational leadership would be positively related to organizational colorblindness (H1), which would in turn predict followers organizational identification (H2) and façades of conformity (H3) and, thereby, partially mediating the relationship between transformational leadership and these outcomes (H4a-b); however, these hypotheses could not be sufficiently examined with our data. Thus, we were relegated to examining the degree to which transformational leadership was associated with valuing diversity on a continuum. After accounting for our control variables, transformational leadership predicted

perceptions of multiculturalism, such that as transformational leadership behaviors increased, followers' perceived greater value in diversity in their organization, supporting hypothesis 5. Results indicate that multiculturalism did not predict minority followers' organizational identification as proposed by hypothesis 6; however, it was negatively related for their reports of creating façades of conformity, supporting hypothesis 7.

We expected that the degree to which transformational leadership behaviors conveyed a value in diversity by fostering a multicultural climate would mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and minority followers' organizational identification (H8a) and façades of conformity (H8b). The indirect effect of transformational leadership on organizational identification via multiculturalism was not significant (.01, $p > .05$), and transformational leadership maintained a significant positive direct effect on organizational identification. Thus, our hypothesis was not supported. By contrast, the indirect effect of transformational leadership on façades of conformity via multiculturalism was significant (.323, $p < .05$), supporting our hypothesis.

Moderation-Mediation. The first moderated-mediation model added *confronting behaviors* as a first stage moderator, and racial-ethnic identification as a second stage moderator. Overall, this model had poor fit to the data, (χ^2 (13) =34.09, $p < .05$; CFI = .92, TLI = .73, RMSEA= 0.07, SRMR= 0.02. Parameter estimates are summarized in Table 10. Hypotheses 9a and 10 could not be examined. *Confronting behaviors* were expected to be a first stage moderator of the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational multiculturalism (H9b). Neither confronting behaviors nor the product of transformational leadership and confronting behaviors predicted organizational multiculturalism, failing to support this hypothesis. Finally, minority followers' racial-ethnic identification was

hypothesized as a second stage moderator of the relationship between organizational diversity ideologies and both organizational identification and façades of conformity. In this model, multiculturalism did not predict organizational identification or façades of conformity. Whereas racial identity did not predict organizational identification, racial identity predicted façades of conformity. Still, the joint effect of organizational multiculturalism and racial identity did not predict organizational identification or façades of conformity, failing to support hypothesis 11.

Next, we changed the previous model by specifying *seeking behaviors* as a first stage moderator for Model 2. This model also had poor fit to the data, (χ^2 (13) =38.78, p <.05; CFI = .89, TLI = .66, RMSEA= 0.08, SRMR= 0.03). Parameter estimates are summarized in Table 11. Seeking behaviors and the joint effect of seeking behaviors and transformational leadership both did not predict organizational multiculturalism, again failing to provide support for hypothesis. Again, multiculturalism did not predict organizational identification or façades of conformity, The joint effect of racial identity and organizational multiculturalism also did not predict organizational identification or façades of conformity.

Lastly, we modified this model to have *including behaviors* as a first stage moderator, which again had poor fit to the data, (χ^2 (13) =35.40, p <.05; CFI = .91, TLI = .71, RMSEA= 0.07, SRMR= 0.02); parameter estimates may be referred to in Table 12. Including behaviors had a main effect on organizational multiculturalism; however, multiculturalism and the joint effect of organizational multiculturalism and transformational leadership on organizational multiculturalism were not significant predictors The same pattern for racial identity was observed, and the joint effect of racial identity and organizational multiculturalism did not predict organizational identification or façades of conformity.

Additional Models

We examined an alternative model, specifying control variables, all leadership behaviors as predictors of organizational multiculturalism, as well as transformational leadership, multiculturalism, and racial-ethnic identity as predictors of organizational identity and façades of conformity. This model did not adequately fit our data (χ^2 (14) =36.12, p <.05; CFI = 0.91, TLI = .74; RMSEA= 0.07, SRMR= 0.02). Parameter estimates (Table 13) support that transformational leadership, including behaviors, and seeking behaviors predicted organizational multiculturalism. However, contrary to our expectations, seeking behaviors had a negative relationship with multiculturalism, which may reflect suppression effects, as the zero-order correlation between these variables was positive. Increases in both multiculturalism and racial identity predicted decreases in façades of conformity; but, they were not related to organizational identification. This is not surprising, given the high correlation among leadership behaviors.

Next, we examined a model with all leadership behaviors specified as predictors of organizational multiculturalism, organizational identification, and façades of conformity, as well as multiculturalism and racial identity as a predictor of organizational identification and façades of conformity (Table 14). This model also had inadequate fit to our data (χ^2 (8) =28.97, p <.05; CFI = 0.92, TLI = .57; RMSEA= 0.08, SRMR= 0.02). Leadership behaviors exhibited the same pattern of relationships with multiculturalism as in the previous model. Only transformational leadership predicted organizational identification and only seeking behaviors and racial identity predicted façades of conformity. However, the relationship between seeking behaviors and façades of conformity was positive, again contrary to what was expected.

Then, an additional alternative model was specified with transformational leadership, including behaviors, and confronting behaviors predicting multiculturalism; including behaviors,

confronting behaviors, multiculturalism, and racial identity predicting façades of conformity; and, transformational leadership predicting organizational identification (Table 15). Again, fit was not sufficient for this model (χ^2 (13) = 29.25, p <.05; CFI = 0.94, TLI = .80; RMSEA= 0.06, SRMR= 0.20). Only transformational leadership predicted organizational multiculturalism, and it predicted organizational identification, as well. Façades of conformity was predicted only by racial identity.

Finally, we examined a direct effects only model including control variables where all leadership behaviors, organizational multiculturalism, and racial identification predicted organizational identification and façades of conformity. This model had excellent fit to our data (χ^2 (2) = .44, p >.05; CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.20; RMSEA= 0.00, SRMR= 0.00), and parameter estimates are reported in Table 16. Beyond the effects of control variables, increases in transformational leadership predicted increases in organizational identification, and both seeking behaviors and racial identity predicted façades of conformity. However, increases in seeking behaviors again predicted increases in façades of conformity; whereas higher racial identity predicts decreases in façades of conformity. Importantly, this model did not fit significantly better than the mediated model. Using the AIC and BIC to compare the fit of this model (AIC=10528.67; BIC=10640.47) to that of our partially mediated model (AIC=7269.35; BIC=7381.15) suggests that our mediated model had better fit to our data.

Table 1

Summary of Sample Characteristics.

	Overall	Chain-referral	Mturk
N	349	236	113
Female	55.9%	64.0%	39.8%
Hispanic	45.8%	53.8%	29.2%
Race			
Asian	15.2%	4.7%	37.2%
Black	35.2%	38.6%	28.3%
White (Hispanic)	38.1%	45.3%	23.0%
Native American	1.1%	0.4%	2.7%
Multi-racial	10.3%	11.0%	8.8%
Average Age	34.28	36.11	30.52
Education			
no degree	18.9%	16.9%	23.0%
Associate	13.8%	13.6%	14.2%
Bachelor's	50.1%	49.6%	51.3%
Master's	13.2%	15.3%	8.8%
Ph.D. / M.D	4.0%	4.6%	2.7%
Management	28.2%	24.6%	35.4%
Tenure			
Less than 1 year	15.8%	15.7%	15.9%
1-5 years	57.9%	58.5%	56.6%
6-10 years-	15.8%	13.6%	20.4%
11-15 years	6.9%	8.1%	4.4%
16 years or above	3.4%	4.2%	1.8%

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and intercorrelations among control and study variables.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender	0.56	0.50	(n/a)						
2. Management Status	0.72	0.45	0.15*	(n/a)					
3. Supervisor Dominant Status	0.89	0.32	0.03	-0.09	(n/a)				
4. Percent Similarity	33.44	26.61	0.06	0.10*	-0.40*	(n/a)			
5. Org Diversity Management	3.05	1.18	0.01	0.11*	0.00	0.08	(.90)		
6. Transformational Leadership	2.35	0.90	0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.11*	0.21*	(.96)	
7. Confronting Behaviors	1.69	1.26	-0.05	-0.08	-0.05	0.05	0.19*	0.54*	(.92)
8. Seeking Behaviors	1.32	1.06	-0.06	-0.04	0.00	-0.01	0.24*	0.55*	0.63*
9. Including Behaviors	1.69	1.21	0.00	0.00	-0.07	0.01	0.29*	0.61*	0.60*
10. Organizational Identification	3.54	0.78	-0.07	-0.19*	0.08	0.09	0.22*	0.34*	0.22*
11. Façade of Conformity	2.68	0.81	-0.10	-0.08	0.01	-0.10	-0.06	-0.19*	-0.15*
12. Multiculturalism	3.70	0.74	-0.04	0.09	-0.03	0.18*	0.47*	0.45*	0.36*
13. Colorblindness	3.76	0.80	-0.08	0.13	0.00	0.09	0.30*	0.49*	0.31*
14. Racial Identification	4.23	0.74	0.12	0.10	-0.04	0.04	0.04	0.25*	0.16*

Note. * indicates $p < .05$. Coefficient alphas are reported in parentheses along the diagonal.

Table 2 continued

	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Gender							
2. Management Status							
3. Supervisor Dominant Status							
4. Percent Similarity							
5. Org Diversity Management							
6. Transformational Leadership							
7. Confronting Behaviors							
8. Seeking Behaviors	(.85)						
9. Including Behaviors	0.70*	(.90)					
10. Organizational Identification	0.22*	0.25*	(.86)				
11. Façade of Conformity	0.01	-0.12*	-0.15*	(.78)			
12. Multiculturalism	0.29*	0.43*	0.26*	-0.22*	(.84)		
13. Colorblindness	0.20*	0.32*	0.32*	-0.20*	0.70*	(.84)	
14. Racial Identification	0.14*	0.20*	0.09	-0.19*	0.32*	0.32*	(.94)

Note. * indicates $p < .05$. Coefficient alphas are reported in parentheses along the diagonal.

Table 3

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
5-factor (IM, II-A, II-B, IS, IC)				*[Not Admissible]*		
3-factor model (IM/IIB, IIA/IC, IS)	841.7*	167	.86	.85	.11	.05
2-factor (IM/IIB, IIA/IC/IS)	772.4*	169	.88	.87	.10	.05
1- factor (Global)	760.4*	170	.88	.87	.10	.05

Model Comparison	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf
3 factor v. 2 factor	69.3*	2
3 factor v. 1 factor	81.3*	3
2 factor v. 1 factor	12.0*	1

Notes. * indicates p<.05.

Table 4

Summary of Measurement Invariance between chain referral and Mturk samples.

Measure	Test	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Transformational Leadership	Configural	1043.8*	340	.86	.85	.11	.05
	Metric	1065.6*	359	.86	.86	.11	.06
	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)	21.8	19				
Multicultural Competency	Configural	302.9*	82	.91	.88	.12	.07
	Metric	307.7*	90	.91	.90	.12	.07
	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)	4.8	8				
Organizational Identification	Configural	55.0*	18	.96	.93	.10	.04
	Metric	63.5*	23	.95	.94	.10	.07
	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)	8.5	5				
Façade of Conformity	Configural	34.2*	10	.95	.90	.11	.04
	Metric	36.4*	14	.95	.93	.09	.05
	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)	2.2	4				
Multiculturalism	Configural	39.1*	10	.96	.93	.13	.05
	Metric	48.3*	14	.95	.93	.13	.11
	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)	9.2	4				
Colorblindness	Configural	57.2*	10	.93	.86	.17	.05
	Metric	71.7*	14	.91	.87	.16	.10
	Partial Metric	63.1*	13	.92	.88	.16	.08
	$\Delta\chi^2$ -Configural v. metric	14.5*	4				
	$\Delta\chi^2$ - Metric v. partial	8.68*	1				
	$\Delta\chi^2$- Configural v. partial	5.9	3				
Racial-ethnic Identification	Configural	200.2*	28	.91	.87	.19	.05
	Metric	212.2*	34	.91	.89	.18	.06
	$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)	12.7	6				

Note. * indicates p <.05.

Table 5

Confirmatory factor analysis of multicultural competency.

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
3-factor (Confront, Seek, Include)	224.3*	41	.93	.90	.12	.07
2-factor (Confront/ Seek, Include)	341.3*	43	.88	.85	.12	.09
1- factor (Global)	614.6*	44	.77	.71	.20	.10

Model Comparison	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	
3 factor v. 2 factor	117.0*	2	
3 factor v. 1 factor	390.3*	3	
2 factor v. 1 factor	26.7*	1	

Note. * indicates p <.05.

Table 6

Latent factors correlations among leadership behaviors.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Inspirational Motivation	(.88)							
2. Idealized Influence -Behaviors	1.003	(.85)						
3. Idealized Influence -Attributes	0.932	0.957	(.82)					
4. Individualized Consideration	0.923	0.941	1.000	(.86)				
5. Intellectual Stimulation	0.921	0.943	0.921	0.996	(.85)			
6. Confronting Behaviors	0.561	0.621	0.550	0.580	0.561	(.92)		
7. Seeking Behaviors	0.566	0.645	0.569	0.658	0.626	0.721	(.85)	
8. Including Behaviors	0.622	0.634	0.674	0.699	0.642	0.673	0.812	(.90)

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .05$. Coefficient alphas are presented in parentheses along the diagonal.

Table 7

Confirmatory factor analysis of transformational leadership and multicultural competence behaviors.

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
5-factor (IM/IIB, IIA/IS/IC, Confront, Seek, Include)	1467.9*	424	.87	.85	.09	.06
4-factor (TFL, Confront, Seek, Include)	1414.4*	428	.87	.86	.08	.05
3- factor (TFL/ Include, Confront, Seek)	1789.3*	431	.83	.81	.10	.08
3- factor (TFL/ Confront, Seek, Include)	2171.6*	431	.78	.76	.11	.09
3- factor (TFL/ Seek , Confront, Include)	1804.9*	431	.82	.81	.10	.08

Model Comparison	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	
5 factor v. 4 factor	53.5*	4	
4 factor v. 3 factor (TFL/ Include, Confront, Seek)	374.9*	3	
4 factor v. 3 factor (TFL/ Confront, Seek, Include)	757.2*	3	
4 factor v. 3 factor (TFL/ Seek , Confront, Include)	390.5*	3	

Note. * indicates p <.05.

Table 8

Factor loadings from Exploratory factor analysis of diversity ideology items.

Item	1	2	3
1. ... despite cultural differences, we are all the same when it comes to working.	*.89*	.20	.01
2. ... shouldn't acknowledge racial difference because we are really all the same.	*.82*	.00	-.04
3. ... treats everyone the same no matter what their ethnicity is.	.14	*.59*	.25
4. … best to judge one another as individuals rather than as members of an ethnic group.	.03	*.76*	.01
5. … should be considered as members of the organization before consideration is given to their ethnicity.	.17	*.53*	.12
6. ... thinks positively about cultural differences of colleagues.	-.07	.22	*.58*
7. ... understands and accepts different cultures.	.02	.16	*.79*
8. ... recommends working with people with cultural different backgrounds.	.13	-.03	*.72*
9. Differences in cultural backgrounds are discussed openly…	.10	-.06	*.56*
10. ... takes differences in cultural traditions and habits into account.	-.08	.15	*.46*
11. ... sees the advantage of differences in cultural backgrounds of employees.	-.03	.21	*.65*

Notes. EFA conducted with varimax oblique rotation in MPlus. χ^2 (25) = 51.26, p<.05; CFI = .99, TLI = .97, RMSEA= .06, SRMR= .02).

Table 9

Standardized parameter estimates for the mediation model.

	Criterion		
Control Variables	Organizational Multiculturalism	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Multiculturalism	0.126*		
Race- Organizational Identification		0.204*	
Race- Façade of Conformity			0.125*
Gender		-0.055	-0.071
Management Status	0.006	-0.203*	-0.01
Relationship Tenure	-0.023	0.063	0.119*
Percent Similarity	0.065	0.059	-0.022
Organizational Diversity Management	0.342	0.094	0.065
Predictor			
Transformational Leadership	0.375*	0.323*	-0.110
Multiculturalism		0.034	-0.149*

Note. * indicates p <.05.

Table 10

Standardized parameter estimates for the moderated-mediation model with confronting behaviors.

	Criterion		
Control Variables	Organizational Multiculturalism	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Multiculturalism	0.121*		
Race- Organizational Identification		0.210*	
Race- Façade of Conformity			0.128*
Gender		-0.055	-0.056
Management Status	0.014	-0.208*	0.002
Relationship Tenure	-0.025	0.061	0.128*
Percent Similarity	0.068	0.055	-0.025
Organizational Diversity Management	0.335*	0.101	0.051
Predictor			
Transformational Leadership	0.343*	0.312*	-0.076
Confronting Behaviors	0.083		
Transformational x Confronting	0.060		
Multiculturalism		0.020	-0.122
Racial Identity		0.048	-0.140*
Multiculturalism x Racial Identity		0.030	-0.036

Note. * indicates $p < .05$.

Table 11

Standardized parameter estimates for the moderated-mediation model with seeking behaviors.

	Criterion		
Control Variables	Organizational Multiculturalism	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Multiculturalism	0.124*		
Race- Organizational Identification		0.205*	
Race- Façade of Conformity			0.128*
Gender		-0.054	-0.056
Management Status	0.008	-0.210*	0.003
Relationship Tenure	-0.025	0.061	0.129*
Percent Similarity	0.06	0.054	-0.025
Organizational Diversity Management	0.347*	0.103*	0.052
Predictor			
Transformational Leadership		0.310*	0.276
Seeking Behaviors	0.371*		
Transformational x Seeking	-0.009		
Multiculturalism		0.025	-0.122
Racial Identity		0.050	-0.139
Multiculturalism x Racial Identity		0.038 `	-0.036

Note. * indicates $p < .05$.

Table 12

Standardized parameter estimates for the moderated-mediation model with including behaviors.

	Criterion		
Control Variables	Organizational Multiculturalism	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Multiculturalism	0.116*		
Race- Organizational Identification		0.205*	
Race- Façade of Conformity			0.128*
Gender		-0.055	-0.056
Management Status	0.012	-0.211*	0.003
Relationship Tenure	-0.025	0.063	0.128*
Percent Similarity	0.081	0.059	-0.025
Organizational Diversity Management	0.32	0.093	0.055
Predictor			
Transformational Leadership		0.311*	-0.081
Including Behaviors	0.271*		
Transformational x Including	0.154*		
Multiculturalism	0.021	0.032	-0.124
Racial Identity		0.051	-0.135*
Multiculturalism x Racial Identity		0.041	-0.037

Note. * indicates p <.05.

Table 13

Parameter estimates for alternative model 1.

	Criterion		
Control Variables	Organizational Multiculturalism	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Multiculturalism	0.120*		
Race- Organizational Identification		0.205*	
Race- Façade of Conformity			0.127
Gender		-0.053	-0.059
Management Status	0.021	-0.205*	-0.001
Relationship Tenure	-0.016	0.059	0.131*
Percent Similarity	0.070	0.058	-0.026
Organizational Diversity Management	0.325*	0.103	0.05
Predictor			
Transformational Leadership	0.276	0.310*	-0.075
Confronting Behaviors	0.125		
Seeking Behaviors	-0.156*		
Including Behaviors	0.185*		
Organizational Multiculturalism		0.026	-0.124
Racial Identity		0.041	-0.129

Note. * indicates p <.05.

Table 14

Parameter estimates for alternative model 2.

	Criterion		
Control Variables	Organizational Multiculturalism	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Multiculturalism	0.070	0.021	-0.009
Race- Organizational Identification			
Race- Façade of Conformity			
Gender		-0.052	-0.065
Management Status	0.022	-0.214*	-0.014
Relationship Tenure	-0.023	0.043	0.128*
Percent Similarity	0.089	0.056	-0.042
Organizational Diversity			
Management	0.347*	0.133	0.009
Predictor			
Transformational Leadership	0.269*	0.293*	-0.111
Including Behaviors	0.188*	0.01	-0.047
Confronting Behaviors	0.129	-0.032	-0.145
Seeking Behaviors	-0.154*	0.017	0.244*
Organizational Multiculturalism		0.069	-0.115
Racial Identity		0.013	-0.118*

Note. * indicates $p < .05$.

Table 15

Parameter estimates for alternative model 3.

	Criterion		
Control Variables	Organizational Multiculturalism	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Multiculturalism			
Race- Organizational Identification		0.205*	
Race- Façade of Conformity			0.120*
Gender		-0.05	-0.066
Management Status	0.023	-0.201*	-0.01
Relationship Tenure	-0.019	0.06	0.136*
Percent Similarity	0.077	0.061	-0.029
Organizational Diversity Management	0.318*	0.112*	0.046
Predictor			
Transformational Leadership	0.262*	0.329*	
Including Behaviors	0.115		0.028
Confronting Behaviors	0.076		-0.090
Organizational Multiculturalism			-0.133
Racial Identity			-0.130*

Note. * indicates p <.05.

Table 16

Parameter estimates for alternative model 4- direct effects model.

Control Variables	Organizational Identification	Facades of Conformity
Race- Organizational Identification	0.205*	
Race- Façade of Conformity		0.112*
Gender	-0.055	-0.053
Management Status	-0.205*	-0.007
Relationship Tenure	0.059	0.126*
Percent Similarity	0.061	-0.018
Organizational Diversity Management	0.106	0.020
Predictor		
Transformational Leadership	0.302*	-0.109
Including Behaviors	0.031	-0.049
Confronting Behaviors	0.008	-0.137
Seeking Behaviors	-0.026	0.231*
Organizational Multiculturalism	0.016	-0.099
Racial Identity	0.044	-0.122*

Note. * indicates $p < .05$.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Although emerging research has begun to establish the positive influence of

transformational leadership on the performance of diverse groups (e.g. Kearney & Gebert, 2009;

Shin & Zhou, 2007), the context of racial-ethnic diversity has not been considered. Specifically,

researchers have overlooked the potential negative ramifications that the underlying mechanism

of transformational leadership, fostering organizational identification, may have in the context of

racialized hierarchies and power dynamics that render minorities devalued members of the

workplace (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2007; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). While transformational leaders

may be generally effective in groups or organizations, there may be potential for them to foster

an exclusionary environment for minority followers, as researchers have suggested competing

diversity ideologies may be used by transformational leaders to promote an organizational

identity.

On the one hand, researchers have argued that transformational leaders will foster an

organizational identity by minimizing the salience of differences to recategorize followers into a

collective group; whereas, others have argued that transformational leaders will espouse the

value of differences and help followers to work through diversity related conflicts. Existing

research has established that the degree to which organizations value diversity and the

endorsement of multiculturalism are associated with the affirmation of minorities' identities and

their engagement in the workplace (Plaut et al., 2009; Stevens et al., 2008). By contrast,

colorblind organizations that attempt to manage intergroup relations by ignoring differences

place pressure on minorities to conform to dominant norms (Brickson, 2000; Hewlin, 2003, 2009; Roberts, 2005; Stevens et al., 2008), leading to minorities' disengagement and psychological strain (Brickson, 2000; Cox & Blake, 1991; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Padilla & Perez, 2003; Kahn, 1990). Thus, illuminating the organizational diversity ideology used by transformational leaders is important to understanding their impact on minority experiences in the workplace.

Unfortunately, our measurement of organizational diversity ideology was not sound. Our results supported that items related to treating employees as individuals rather than members of racial groups represented a distinct factor apart from not acknowledging differences and valuing diversity. Furthermore, these items were highly correlated with multiculturalism items and the remaining colorblindness items, and colorblindness and multiculturalism were also strongly, positively related. It is possible that fatigue may have influenced the relationship between these variables, as colorblindness and multiculturalism items were presented later in the survey when participants may have been less conscientious in their responses. Social desirability may have also played a role in how participants responded. Some participants may have taken the survey while at work, creating a pressure to respond in a way that was favorable towards their leader or organization; minority followers may have responded favorably to all ideology items, creating high correlations between these measures.

Alternatively, these relationships may be meaningful. While this may initially appear counterintuitive, findings from Knowles et al. (2009) provide insight into the meaning of these relationships. According to their findings, dominant group members may construe colorblindness to be associated with different justice principles—colorblindness as a procedural justice principle is associated with supporting equal treatment in a way that reasserts the status

quo; whereas, colorblindness as a distributive justice principle is associated with decreasing inequalities between groups. Relatedly, Purdie-Vaughs et al. (2008) found that organizational ideologies may be differentially related to psychological outcomes of minority employees depending on the demographic composition of the organization, suggesting that ideology interpretation by minorities may be malleable depending on context, as well.

Taken together, it is possible that for minorities, the notion of supporting equal treatment and treatment as an individual rather than as a member of a minority ethnic group may be construed differently. Specifically, for minorities in the workplace that face the threat of discrimination or exclusion, colorblindness may be associated with maintaining the status quo by not acknowledging differences. However, interpreted another way, those items may be inferred as minimizing differential treatment based on race, perhaps decreasing inequalities associated with being a minority by supporting the recognition and value of diversity. Although, there was a lot of variability in the percent similarity reported by participants, this was not correlated with colorblindness. Still, it may have influenced the interpretation of these questions, such that those that experienced higher percent similarity may have interpreted colorblindness questions more positively than those that perceive lower percent similarity in race.   Thus, in the current sample, the measures that were created for this study may not sufficiently represent the constructs of colorblindness and multiculturalism as intended. Subsequent analyses were modified to examine the degree to which leaders' behaviors were associated with value for diversity, consistent with the original purpose of the multiculturalism scale.

We expected that transformational leaders intending to foster organizational identification in diverse groups may inadvertently facilitate a climate that encourages minority conformity (Cox, 1994; Cox & Blake, 1991; Hewlin, 2003, 2009). Thus, transformational

leadership behaviors may not be universally appropriate in all contexts and may require additional competencies. We argued that transformational leaders need to be aware of their cultural sensitivity and work to exhibit behaviors that also demonstrate support for the inclusion of minorities (Canen & Canen, 2004; Cox, 2001). In doing so, we predicted that transformational leaders would promote multiculturalism, enabling them to increase both motivation toward goals and valuing diversity that facilitates both group effectiveness and affirmation of subgroup identities (Luijters et al., 2008; van Dick et al, 2008; van Knippenberg et al., 2007).

Consistent with recommendations by Graen et al. (2010), we first established the distinctiveness of our leadership constructs; that is, could our followers differentiate between the constructs of transformational leadership and multicultural competency and did our measures differentiate between these constructs. Our preliminary analyses established transformational leadership and multicultural competence as distinct yet positively related constructs when evaluated by minority followers. Specifically, CFA supported that these behaviors represented distinct factors, and intercorrelations further showed that there were stronger correlations within constructs than between them. However, these behaviors were still strongly related in our sample, and not all dimensions of multicultural competency demonstrated incremental validity. This is not surprising, as from a minority perspective, evaluations of interactions with one's leader as an individual and how they relate to minority followers will be related.

Still, including behaviors consistently predicted multiculturalism after accounting for transformational leadership, providing some evidence that these behaviors have added value in shaping perceptions of the value of diversity in organizations. Therefore, not all aspects of multicultural competency can be assumed to be encompassed by existing leadership theories

(c.f., Inceoglu & Bartram, 2012), and future research should continue to establish its construct validity. Interestingly, while seeking behaviors had a positive zero-order correlation with multiculturalism, it consistently predicted decreases in multiculturalism. This represents a case of negative net suppression (Krus & Wilkinson, 1986) and is likely caused by the high correlation it exhibits with other leadership behaviors compared to the weaker correlation it has with multiculturalism.

Further, our results suggest that no dimension of multicultural competency moderated the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational multiculturalism; that is, regardless of the degree to which leaders exhibited multicultural competency, increases in transformational leadership predicted more multiculturalism. While inconsistent with our hypotheses, this finding still proves valuable in clarifying the underlying approach to diversity management by transformational leaders. Specifically, counter to arguments that transformational leaders manage diversity by minimizing differences, we supported that these behaviors are associated with fostering a value for diversity in diverse organizations when evaluated by minority followers. Researchers should not assume transformational leaders emphasize similarity at the expense of differences across all contexts and should explicitly measure these mediators, as those assumptions may lead to misinforming practice and undermining leader effectiveness. Future studies examining the role of transformational leadership in diverse groups should better integrate their arguments with diversity management literatures to construct more informed hypotheses and conclusions.

Moreover, multiculturalism plays a key role in diversity management by transformational leaders, potentially explaining how they minimize pressures to conform and minorities' need for compliance behaviors during their efforts to promote the organizational identity. Specifically,

multiculturalism mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and façades of conformity.   Importantly, however, our result showed that transformational leadership maintained a direct effect on minority followers' organizational identification, and multiculturalism did not mediate this relationship. Kark and Shamir (2002) discuss a variety of strategies used by transformational leaders to foster organizational identification, which may entail distinguishing the organization based on performance or other shared values, heightening the salience of shared performance goals, redesigning work tasks to increase interdependence, or providing opportunities for professional development. Our findings make sense given that diversity management may represent only one aspect of how transformational leaders foster an organizational identity.

Taken together, we supported that transformational leadership has an impact on minority followers' organizational identification and compliance behaviors, and it may be important for future research to consider both mechanisms, as well as other factors that may explain these processes. However, in the current study, transformational leaders had positive implications for both of these outcomes, contrary to our initial expectations, which may be attributed to how our minority respondents strongly associated transformational leadership with having multicultural competency.

Finally, we aimed to examine the role of followers' individual differences and variability within minorities in this process, focusing on minorities' racial identification because this has been argued to influence how they respond to leadership behaviors and organizational diversity initiatives (c.f., Howell & Shamir, 2005; Thomas & Chrobot-Mason, 2002). Our results did not support racial-ethic identification as a moderator of the relationship between multiculturalism and our outcomes. This is contrary to research that suggests that higher racial-ethnic

identification among minorities is associated with the endorsement of multiculturalism and should, therefore, influence how this ideology relates to their organizational attachment. However, there was some evidence that suggests increases racial-ethnic identification does predict decreases minorities' façades of conformity, which is consistent with research supporting higher racial-ethnic identification as a source of self-esteem that allows minorities to respond to devaluation by resisting pressures to conform (e.g., Doosje et al 2002; Roberts, et al., 2008).

With the costly consequences minority exclusion has for organizational effectiveness (e.g., McKay et al., 2007; McKay et al., 2008), it is in the organizations' best interest to find a leadership approach that facilitates the performance of diverse groups while also better integrating minorities, ensuing that organizations are leveraging their diverse talent rather than suppressing minority perspectives to achieve superficial cohesion. With this knowledge from the current study, organizations and researchers alike can better understand the implications of transformational leadership behaviors for managing diversity. We provide some insight for leadership development and diversity training, illuminating how transformational leadership should be enacted to effectively frame attitudes towards organizational diversity, foster positive intergroup relations, communicate across groups, and promote minority inclusion. Transformational leadership need not suppress differences to highlight similarities in an effort to create a shared identity. Rather, leaders should promote the value in diversity as a basis of cohesion. Training should be designed to help transformational leaders better understand differences and the dynamics that affect minority experiences and intergroup relations, and should highlight how including behaviors can be incorporated into one's leadership style.

Limitations

The conclusions drawn from the current study must be discussed in light of several limitations that provide directions for future research. First, our measurement of organizational diversity ideology was not consistent with our hypotheses, as colorblindness and multiculturalism were not supported as distinct constructs. Future research will benefit from adequately exploring the implications of these competing explanatory mechanisms in diversity management by transformational leaders as we originally intended because research has generally established that these ideologies are distinct yet coexist within work units (Larkey, 1999; Plaut et al., 2009).

Secondly, while the purpose of our study was to explore the psychological implications of transformational leadership for minority followers, this does limit the generalizability of our findings to other domains. Specifically, for our minority sample, transformational leadership and multicultural competency were different but strongly related constructs However, in a dominant group sample, these variables may have a weaker relationship because individualized behaviors of transformational leadership does not confer interaction with a minority employee for those followers. However, multicultural competence behaviors then have the potential to play more of an incremental or moderating role in creating a multicultural climate from the perspective of these employees. Further construct development should be done with a broader, representative sample to examine the value of multicultural competency in managing domestic diversity by transformational leaders. Moreover, research would benefit from examining the hypothesized structural relationships from a dominant perspective to better understand this process and inform practice.

An additional limitation of our study was the method of sampling. While chain-referral sampling and Mturk sampling have been shown to be useful for psychological research as discussed, these approaches limit the researchers control over who participates in their study. Namely, self-report information is used to determine the inclusion of participants and anonymity prevents the researcher from having the ability to verify this information. It then becomes difficult to account extraneous factors that may influence the results of the study related to the sample, or to ensure that participants are recruited from an array of organizations across fields. Moreover, without identifying information, it is impossible to control for nesting within these data, or employees that may be colleagues and share a leader. These sampling approaches also hamper the ability to link data across times; thus, all scales must be responded to at the same time and both common method variance and fatigue become more probable.

Finally, although we were interested in the psychological origins of organizational identification or façades of conformity by minority employees by transformational leaders, transformational leadership is often conceptualized as a group level construct. That is, transformational leaders are thought to create collective efficacy towards shared goals (Kark & Shamir, 2002; Shamir et al., 1993). Examining the hypotheses of this study at a group level would prove beneficial to understanding the process of transformational leadership and diversity management, as it would allow the research to have some control over modeling actual diversity of units and aggregated climate perceptions, as well as accounting for followers nested within a shared leader.

Conclusion

In sum, our study was novel in its attempt to address several criticisms of transformational leadership theory, by integrating social identity perspectives of social

discrimination with organizational identity formation to understand how these leadership behaviors may impact intergroup relations when inequalities exist (c.f., Ospina & Foldy, 2009; Pittinsky, 2010). This study took an alternative perspective to the integration of the transformational leadership and diversity management literatures, which focused only on performance related outcomes in diverse groups thus far, and aimed to begin to elucidate the processes whereby transformational leaders exacerbate minority marginalization or foster their sense of belonging to the organization. Moreover, the current study adds to recent efforts to explain underlying mechanisms of TFL (c.f., Yukl, 1996), understand both positive and negative implications of TFL (Tourish, 2013), and uncover whether transformational leadership is a full range theory appropriate in all contexts (c.f., Kark & Shamir, 2002; Yukel, 1996). This is also the first empirical study that examines the role of multicultural competency in transformational leadership. We hope that this work sets the stage for future research to continue to integrate organizational leadership and diversity management literatures.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L.S. & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 13-17. http://webuser.bus.umich.edu/janedut/ Identity/amr-albert.pdf

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, *103*(3), 411-423. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411

Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial Color Blindness Emergence, Practice, and Implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*(3), 205-209. doi: 10.1177/0963721411434980

Apfelbaum, E. P., Pauker, K., Sommers, S. R., & Ambady, N. (2010). In blind pursuit of racial equality?. *Psychological Science*, *21*(11), 1587-1592. doi:10.1177/0956797610384741

Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *95*(4), 918-932. doi:10.1037/a0011990

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, *34*(3), 325-374. doi: 10.1177/0149206308316059

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of management review*, 20-39.   http://www.jstor.org/stable/258189

Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Thomas, K. M., Johnson, C. D., & Mack, D. A. (2007). Assessing the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure for measurement equivalence across racial and ethnic groups. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *67*(5), 877-888. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2004.15112544

Barger, P., Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., & Sinar, E. F. (2011). IO and the crowd: Frequently asked questions about using mechanical turk for research. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, *49*, 11-17. http://www.siop.org/tip/oct11/492_features.pdf

Barger, P. B., & Sinar, E. F. (2011). Psychological data from Amazon. com's MTurk: Rapid and inexpensive–but high-quality. In *the Annual Convention of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago, IL*.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(1), 9-32. doi:10.1080/135943299398410

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., Meade, A. W., & Wiebe, E. N. (2011). The viability of crowdsourcing for survey research. *Behavior research methods*, *43*(3), 800-813. doi: 0.3758/s13428-011-0081-0

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*, 238–246. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238

Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.

Bell, E. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented Black women. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 459-478. doi:10.1002/job.4030110607

Bell, E., & Nkomo, S. (2001). *Our separate ways: Black and White women and the struggle for professional identity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: double jeopardy for minority women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(2), 426-436. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.426

Biernacki, P., & Waldorf, D. (1981). Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *10*(2), 141-163. doi:10.1177/004912418101000205

Bommer, W. H., Rich, G. A., & Rubin, R. S. (2005). Changing attitudes about change: Longitudinal effects of transformational leader behavior on employee cynicism about organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(7), 733-753. doi:10.1002/job.342

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-Concordance at Work: Toward Understanding the

 Motivational Effects of Transformational Leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*,

 46(5), 554-571. doi:10.2307/30040649

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same

 time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*(5), 475-482.

 doi:10.1177/0146167291175001

Brickson, S. (2000). The impact of identity orientation on individual and organizational

 outcomes in demographically diverse settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 82-101.

 http://www.jstor.org/stable/259264

Brief, A.P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R.R., Pugh, S.D., and Vaslow, J.B. (2000). Just Doing Business:

 Modern Racism and Obedience to Authority as Explanations for Employment

 Discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*(1), 72-97.

 doi :10.1006/obhd.1999.2867

Bruneau, E. G., & Saxe, R. (2012). The power of being heard: The benefits of 'perspective-

 giving' in the context of intergroup conflict. *Journal of Experimental Social

 Psychology,48,* 855-866. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.017

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk A New Source

 of Inexpensive, Yet High-Quality, Data?. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*(1), 3-

 5. doi: 10.1177/1745691610393980

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Canen, A. G., & Canen, A. (2004). Multicultural competence and trust: a new road for logistics

 management?. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, *11*(3), 38-53.

 doi:10.1108/13527600410797837

Canen, A. G., & Canen, A. (2008). Multicultural Leadership: the costs of its absence in

organizational conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict*

Management, *19*(1), 4-19. doi: 10.1108/10444060810849155

Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. J. (2001). The influence of demographic heterogeneity on the

emergence and consequences of cooperative norms in work teams. *Academy of*

Management Journal, 956-974. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3069440

Chatman, J. A., Polzer, J. T., Barsade, S. G., & Neale, M. A. (1998). Being different yet feeling

similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work

processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 749-780.

http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393615

Chen, C. C., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). New directions for research and practice in diversity

leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*, 285-302. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90045-4

Cheney, G. (1983). The rhetoric of identification and the study of organizational communication.

Quarterly Journal of Speech, *69*(2), 143-158. doi:10.1080/00335638309383643

Chrobot-Mason, D., & Ruderman, M. (2004). Leadership in a diverse workplace. In M.

Stockdale & F. Crosby (Eds.), *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity*

(pp. 100-121). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Chrobot-Mason, D., Ruderman, M. N., Weber, T. J., Ohlott, P. J., & Dalton, M. A. (2007).

Illuminating a cross-cultural leadership challenge: When identity groups collide. *The*

International Journal of Human Resource Management, *18*(11), 2011-2036.

doi:10.1080/09585190701639778

Chrobot-Mason, D., & Thomas, K. M. (2002). Minority employees in majority organizations: The intersection of individual and organizational racial identity in the workplace. *Human Resource Development Review*, *1*(3), 323-344. doi:10.1177/1534484302013004

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 591-621. doi:0.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902. 142015

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*, 637-647. http://www.jstor.org/stable/258069

Correll, J., Park, B., & Smith, J. A. (2008). Colorblind and multicultural prejudice reduction strategies in high-conflict situations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *11*(4), 471-491. doi: 10.1177/1368430208095401

Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cox, T.H. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *The Executive*, 45-56. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4165021

Cox, T., & Finley‐Nickelson, J. (1991). Models of Acculturation for Intra‐organizational Cultural Diversity. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *8*(2), 90-101. doi: 10.1111/j.1936-4490.1991.tb00548.x

Cox, T. H., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 827-847. doi: 10.2307/256391

Cox, T. H., & Nkomo, S. M. (1991). A race and gender-group analysis of the early career experience of MBAs. *Work and Occupations*, *18*(4), 431-446. doi:10.1177/0730888491018004004

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1995). The psychology of nigrescence: Revising the Cross model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, &   C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 93–122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, W., & Strauss, L. (1998). The everyday functions of African American identity. In J. Swim, & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective.* New York: Academic Press.

Davidson, M., & Friedman, R. A. (1 998). When excuses don't work: The persistent injustice effect among Black managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 43, 154- 183. http://moe.owen.edu/vanderbilt/data/research/346full.pdf

De Cremer, D. (2006). Unfair treatment and revenge taking: The roles of collective identification and feelings of disappointment. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *10*(3), 220-232. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.10.3.220

Deitch, E. A., Barsky, A., Butz, R. M., Chan, S., Brief, A. P., & Bradley, J. C. (2003). Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, *56*(11), 1299-1324. doi:10.1177/00187267035611002

Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of organizational change management*, *17*(2), 177-193. doi:10.1108/09534810410530601

DiTomaso, N., & Hooijberg, R. (1996). Diversity and the demands of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*, 163-187. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90039-9

Doosje, B., Spears, R., & Ellemers, N. (2002). Social identity as both cause and effect: The development of group identification in response to anticipated and actual changes in the intergroup status hierarchy. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*(1), 57-76. doi: 10.1348/014466602165054

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *82*(1), 62-68. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.62

Dreher, G. F., & Cox Jr, T. H. (1996). Race, gender, and opportunity: a study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(3), 297-308. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.3.297

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative science quarterly*, 239-263. http://webuser.bus.umich.edu/janedut/Identity/asq-dutton.pdf

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of management journal*, *45*(4), 735-744. doi: 10.2307/3069307

Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: a general analytical framework using moderated path analysis. *Psychological methods*, *12*(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.12.1.1

Edwards, M. R., & Peccei, R. (2010). Perceived organizational support, organizational identification, and employee outcomes: Testing a simultaneous multifoci model. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *9*(1), 17. doi: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000007

Eisenbach, R., Watson, K., & Pillai, R. (1999). Transformational leadership in the context of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*(2), 80-89. doi: 10.1108/09534819910263631

Elsass, P. M., & Graves, L. M. (1997). Demographic diversity in decision-making groups: The experiences of women and people of color. *Academy of Management Review*, 946-973. http://www.jstor.org/stable/259250

Ely, R. J. (1995). The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(3), 589-634. doi: 10.2307/256740

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 229-273. doi: 10.2307/2667087

Enders, C. K., & Bandalos, D. L. (2001). The relative performance of full information maximum likelihood estimation for missing data in structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *8*(3), 430-457. doi:10.1207/S15328007SEM0803_5

Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(2), 243-251. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.243

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior research methods*, *41*(4), 1149-1160. doi: 10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Foldy, E. G., Rivard, P., & Buckley, T. R. (2009). Power, safety, and learning in racially diverse groups. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *8*(1), 25-41. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2009.37012177

Foley, S., Kidder, D. L., & Powell, G. N. (2002). The perceived glass ceiling and justice perceptions: An investigation of Hispanic law associates. *Journal of Management*, *28*(4), 471-496. doi: 10.1177/014920630202800401

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common in-group identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. *European review of social psychology*, *4*(1), 1-26. doi: 10.1080/14792779343000004

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Bachman, B. A. (1996). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common in-group identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *20*(3), 271-290. doi: 10.1016/0147-1767(96)00019-3

Gentry, W. A., & Sparks, T. E. (2012). A Convergence/Divergence Perspective of Leadership Competencies Managers Believe are Most Important for Success in Organizations: A Cross-Cultural Multilevel Analysis of 40 Countries. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *27*(1), 15-30. doi: 10.1007/s10869-011-9212-y

Goethals, G. R. (2005). Presidential leadership. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 545-570. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141918

Goodman, L. A. (1961). Snowball sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, *32*(1), 148-170. doi:10.1214/aoms/1177705148

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experience, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of management Journal*, *33*(1), 64-86. doi: 10.2307/256352

Greer L, Homan A, De Hoogh A, Den Hartog D. Tainted visions: The effect of visionary leader behaviors and leader categorization tendencies on the financial performance of ethnically

diverse teams. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*. January 2012; *97*(1), 203-213. doi: 10.1037/a0025583

Haslam, S. A., O'Brien, A., Jetten, J., Vormedal, K., & Penna, S. (2005). Taking the strain: Social identity, social support, and the experience of stress. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*(3), 355-370. doi: 10.1348/014466605X37468

Haslam, S. A., & Reicher, S. (2006). Stressing the group: Social identity and the unfolding dynamics of responses to stress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(5), 1037. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1037

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

Hewlin, P. F. (2003). And the award for best actor goes to...: Façades of conformity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *28*(4), 633-642. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2003.10899442

Hewlin, P. F. (2009). Wearing the cloak: Antecedents and consequences of creating façades of conformity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(3), 727-741. doi: 10.1037/a0015228

Hewstone, M. E., & Brown, R. E. (1986). *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters*. Basil Blackwell. Cambridge, MA

Hoffman, B. J., Bynum, B. H., Piccolo, R. F., & Sutton, A. W. (2011). Person-organization value congruence: How transformational leaders influence work group effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(4), 779-796. http://ron-piccolo.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/2011-AMJ-TFL-Value-Congruence-Hoffman-et-al.pdf

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in

    organizational contexts. *Academy of management review*, 121-140.

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/259266

Holoien, D. S., & Shelton, J. N. (2011). You deplete me: The cognitive costs of colorblindness

    on ethnic minorities. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(2), 562-565. doi:

    10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.010

Homan, A. C., Van Knippenberg, D., Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2007). Bridging

    faultlines by valuing diversity: Diversity beliefs, information elaboration, and

    performance in diverse work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1189-1199. doi:

    10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1189

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000a). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of

    subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *4*(2), 143-156. doi:

    10.1207/S15327957PSPR0402_03

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000b). Intergroup similarity and subgroup relations: Some

    implications for assimilation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(8), 948-

    958. doi: 10.1177/01461672002610005

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000c). Subgroup relations: A comparison of mutual intergroup

    differentiation and common in-group identity models of prejudice reduction. *Personality*

    and Social Psychology Bulletin, *26*(2), 242-256. doi:10.1177/0146167200264010

House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership*

    Quarterly, 3, 81– 108. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(92)90028-E

Howell, J. M., & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member

    exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting

follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(5), 680-694. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.680

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The Role of Followers in the Charismatic Leadership Process: Relationships and Their Consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*(1), 96-112. doi:10.5465/AMR.2005.15281435

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1-55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Huo, Y. J., Molina, L. E., Sawahata, R., & Deang, J. M. (2005). Leadership and the management of conflicts in diverse groups: Why acknowledging versus neglecting subgroup identity matters. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*, 237-254. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.243

Huo, Y. J., Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is separationism the problem; is assimilation the answer?. *Psychological Science*, *7*, 40-45. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1996.tb00664.x

Hüttermann, H., & Boerner, S. (2011). Fostering innovation in functionally diverse teams: the two faces of transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *20*(6), 833-854. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2010.524412

Inceoglu, I., & Bartram, D. (2012). Global leadership: The myth of multicultural competency. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(2), 216-218. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01432.x

Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Demographics of Mechanical Turk. NYU Working Paper No. CEDER-10-01. SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1585030

Ito, T. A., & Urland, G. R. (2003). Race and gender on the brain: Electrocortical measures of attention to the race and gender of multiply categorizable individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 616–626. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.616

Jayne, M. E., & Dipboye, R. L. (2004). Leveraging diversity to improve business performance: Research findings and recommendations for organizations. *Human Resource Management*, *43*(4), 409-424. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20033

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(5), 751. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.751

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of applied psychology*, *89*(5), 755- 768. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, *33*(4), 692-724. doi: 10.2307/256287

Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2002). The dual effect of transformational leadership: Priming relational and collective selves and further effects on followers. In B. J. Avolio, & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead (pp. 62–91). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: empowerment and dependency. *Journal of applied psychology*, *88*(2), 246. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246 246

Kearney, E., & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 77-89. doi: 10.1037/a0013077

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *2*(1), 51-60. http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/hck_compliance_.pdf

Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public opinion quarterly*, *25*(1), 57-78. doi: 10.1086/266996

Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Hogan, C. M., & Chow, R. M. (2009). On the malleability of ideology: motivated construals of color blindness. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *96*(4), 857-856. doi:10.1037/a0013595

Krus, D.J. and Wilkinson, S.M. (1986). Demonstration of properties of a suppressor variable. Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers, 18, 21-24.

Kunze, F., & Bruch, H. (2010). Age-based faultlines and perceived productive energy: The moderation of transformational leadership. *Small Group Research*, *41*(5), 593-620. doi: 10.1177/1046496410366307

Jans, L., Postmes, T., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2012). Sharing differences: The inductive route to social identity formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(5), 1145-1149. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2012.04.013

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of applied psychology*, *89*(5), 755-468. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Lance, C. E., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2002). Confirmatory factor analysis. In F. Drasgow & N. Schmitt (Eds.), *Measuring and analyzing behavior in organizations* (pp. 221–254). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Larkey, L. K. (1999). The Colorblind Conundrum: When Rhetoric and Behavior Are Not Aligned in Work Groups. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *8*, 43-58. http://www.uri.edu/iaics/content/1998v8n2/03%20Linda%20K.%20Larkey.pdf

Levin, S., Matthews, M., Guimond, S., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Kteily, N, & Dover, T. (2012). Assimilation, multiculturalism, and colorblindness: Mediated and moderated relationships between social dominance orientation and prejudice. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48(1), 207-212.

Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. (1998). Ethnic identity, legitimizing ideologies, and social status: A matter of ideological asymmetry. *Political Psychology*, *19*(2), 373-404. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00109

Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(4), 443-453. doi: 10.1177/0146167204271651

Linnehan, F., Chrobot‐Mason, D., & Konrad, A. M. (2006). Diversity attitudes and norms: The role of ethnic identity and relational demography. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(4), 419-442. doi: 10.1002/job.382

Linnehan, F., Konrad, A. M., Reitman, F., Greenhalgh, A., & London, M. (2003). Behavioral goals for a diverse organization: The effects of attitudes, social norms, and racial identity for Asian Americans and Whites. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(7), 1331-1359. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01952.x

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *78*(3), 167-203. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1999.2832

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 385-425. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2

Luijters, K., van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2006). Acculturation strategies among ethnic minority workers and the role of intercultural personality traits. *Group processes & intergroup relations*, *9*(4), 561-575. doi: 10.1177/1368430206067554

Luijters, K., Van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2008). Cultural diversity in organizations: Enhancing identification by valuing differences. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *32*(2), 154-163. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.09.003

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological methods*, *1*(2), 130-149. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, *13*(2), 103-123. doi: 10.1002/job.4030130202

Markus, H. R., Steele, C. M., & Steele, D. M. (2000). Colorblindness as a barrier to inclusion: Assimilation and nonimmigrant minorities. *Daedalus*, 233-259. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20027672

McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Morris, M. A., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M. R. (2007). Racial differences in employee retention: Are diversity climate perceptions the key?. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(1), 35-62. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00064.x

McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2008). Mean Racial-Ethnic Differences in Employee Sales Performance: The Moderating Role of Diversity Climate. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(2), 349-374. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00116.x

McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2009). A tale of two climates: Diversity climate from subordinates' and managers' perspectives and their role in store unit sales performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *62*, 767-791. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01157.x

Merritt, S. M., Ryan, A., Mack, M. J., Leeds, J. P., & Schmitt, N. (2010). Perceived in-group and out-group preference: A longitudinal causal investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*(4), 845-879. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01191.x

Meyerson, D. E., & Scully, M. A. (1995). Crossroads Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change. *Organization Science*, *6*(5), 585-600. doi:10.1287/orsc.6.5.585

Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of management review*, 402-433. http://www.jstor.org/stable/258667

Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and Personal Dimensions in Diversity Climate Ethnic and Gender Differences in Employee Perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *34*(1), 82-104. doi: 10.1177/0021886398341006

Mor Barak, M. E., & Levin, A. (2002). Outside of the corporate mainstream and excluded from the work community: A study of diversity, job satisfaction and well-being. *Community, Work & Family*, *5*(2), 133-157. doi:10.1080/13668800220146346

Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*(2), 158-174. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0302_4

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2007). *Mplus user's guide* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Neville, H. A., Coleman, M. N., Falconer, J. W., & Holmes, D. (2005). Color-blind racial ideology and psychological false consciousness among African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *31*(1), 27-45. doi: 10.1177/0095798404268287

Ng, E. S. (2008). Why organizations choose to manage diversity? Toward a leadership-based theoretical framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, *7*(1), 58-78. doi: 10.1177/1534484307311592

Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader–member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), 1412-1426. doi:10.1037/a0017190

Norton, M. I., Sommers, S. R., Apfelbaum, E. P., Pura, N., & Ariely, D. (2006). Color Blindness and Interracial Interaction Playing the Political Correctness Game. *Psychological Science*, *17*(11), 949-953. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.0181.x

Norton, M. I., Vandello, J. A., Biga, A., & Darley, J. M. (2008). Colorblindness and diversity: Conflicting goals in decisions influenced by race. *Social Cognition*, *26*(1), 102-111. doi: 10.1521/soco.2008.26.1.102

Norton, M. I., Vandello, J. A., & Darley, J. M. (2004). Casuistry and social category bias. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *87*(6), 817. doi:10.1037/0022-514.87.6.817

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, *71*(3), 492-499. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492

Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2009). A critical review of race and ethnicity in the leadership literature: Surfacing context, power and the collective dimensions of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(6), 876-896. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.09.005

Outten, H. R., Schmitt, M. T., Miller, D. A., & Garcia, A. L. (2012). Feeling Threatened About the Future Whites' Emotional Reactions to Anticipated Ethnic Demographic Changes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,*38* (1), 14-25. doi:10.1177/0146167211418531

Padilla, A. M., & Perez, W. (2003). Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *25*(1), 35-55. doi:10.1177/0739986303251694

Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. (2010). Running experiments on amazon mechanical turk. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *5*(5), 411-419. http://repub.eur.nl/res/pub/31983/jdm10630a%5B1%5D.pdf

Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological bulletin*, *108*(3), 499-514. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.499

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure a new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of adolescent research*, *7*(2), 156-176. doi:10.1177/074355489272003

Pittinsky, T. L. (2010). A two-dimensional model of intergroup leadership: The case of national diversity. *American Psychologist*, *65*(3), 194-200. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.09.005

Pittinsky, T. L., & Simon, S. (2007). Intergroup leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(6), 586-605. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.09.005

Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?" Perceptions of exclusion and Whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *101*(2), 337-353. doi: 10.1037/a0022832

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities?. *Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 444-446. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, *88*(5), 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Polzer, J. T., Milton, L. P., & Swarm, W. B. (2002). Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*(2), 296-324. doi: 10.2307/3094807

Polzer, J. T., Swann, W. B., & Milton, L. P. (2003). The benefits of verifying diverse identities for group performance. *Research on Managing Groups and Teams*, *5*, 91-111. doi:10.1016/S1534-0856(02)05004-1

Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Swaab, R. I. (2005). Social influence in small groups: An interactive model of social identity formation. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *16*(1), 1-42. doi: 10.1080/10463280440000062

Postmes, T., Spears, R., Lee, A. T., & Novak, R. J. (2005). Individuality and social influence in groups: inductive and deductive routes to group identity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *89*(5), 747-763. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.89.5.747

Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2012). Modern Racism Attitudes Among White Students: The Role of Dominance and Authoritarianism and the Mediating Effects of Racial Color-Blindness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*,*152*(6), 758-774. doi: 10.1080/00224545.2012.700966

Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate behavioral research*, *42*(1), 185-227. doi: 10.1080/00273170701341316

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: how diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *94*(4), 615-630. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615

Richardson, H. A., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2005). Integrating managerial perceptions and transformational leadership into a work‐unit level model of employee involvement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(5), 561-589. doi: 10.1002/job.329

Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 417-423. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.002

Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*(2), 358-384. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2004.05.005

Rink, F., & Ellemers, N. (2007). Diversity as a basis for shared organizational identity: The norm congruity principle. *British Journal of Management*, *18*(s1), S17-S27. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00523.x

Riordan, C. M., & Shore, L. M. (1997). Demographic diversity and employee attitudes: An empirical examination of relational demography within work units. *Journal of applied psychology*, *82*(3), 342-358. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.342

Roberts, L., & Roberts, D. (2007). Testing the limits of antidiscrimination law: The business, legal and ethical ramification of cultural profiling at work. *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy, 14*, 369-405. http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/djglp14&div=16&id=&page=

Roberts, L. M. (2005). Changing Faces: Professional Image Construction in Diverse Organizational Settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*(4), 685-711. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2005.18378873

Roberts, L. M., Settles, I. H., & Jellison, W. A. (2008). Predicting the strategic identity management of gender and race. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *8*(4), 269-306. doi: 10.1080/15283480802365270

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *19*(3), 301-322. doi:10.1177/0272431699019003001

Ross, J., Irani, L., Silberman, M., Zaldivar, A., & Tomlinson, B. (2010, April). Who are the crowdworkers?: shifting demographics in mechanical turk. In *Proceedings of the 28th of the international conference extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems* (pp. 2863-2872).

Ryan, C. S., Casas, J. F., & Thompson, B. K. (2010). Interethnic ideology, intergroup perceptions, and cultural orientation. *Journal of Social Issues*, *66*(1), 29-44. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01631.x

Ryan, C.S., Hunt, J.S., Weible, J.A., Peterson, C.R., & Casas, J.F. (2007). Multicultural and colorblind ideology, stereotypes, and ethnocentrism among black and white Americans. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*(4), 617-637. doi:10.1177/1368430207084105

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *84*(5), 1079-1092. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1079

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, *4*, 577-594. doi: 10.1287/orsc.4.4.577

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 257-283. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00014-4

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2007). When is educational specialization heterogeneity related to creativity in research and development teams? Transformational leadership as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(6), 1709-1721. doi:10.1108/09534810410530601

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1262-1289. doi:10.1177/0149206310385943

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression. New York: Cambridge University Press

Simmons, S. J., Wittig, M. A., & Grant, S. K. (2010). A mutual acculturation model of multicultural campus climate and acceptance of diversity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*(4), 468-475. doi: 10.1037/a0020237

Sosik, J. J., & Dinger, S. L. (2007). Relationships between leadership style and vision content: The moderating role of need for social approval, self-monitoring, and need for social power. *Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 134– 153. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.01.004

Stam, D. A., Van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. (2010b). The role of regulatory fit in visionary leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 499– 518. doi: 10.1002/job.624

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(5), 797-811. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.797

Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *25*, 173–180. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr2502_4

Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the Benefits of Diversity All-Inclusive Multiculturalism and Positive Organizational Change. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, *44*(1), 116-133. doi:10.1177/0021886308314460

Stewart, M. M., & Johnson, O. E. (2009). Leader–member exchange as a moderator of the relationship between work group diversity and team performance. *Group & Organization Management*, *34*, 507-535. doi: 10.1177/1059601108331220

Swann Jr, W. B., Kwan, V. S., Polzer, J. T., & Milton, L. P. (2003). Fostering group identification and creativity in diverse groups: The role of individuation and self-verification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*(11), 1396-1406. doi: 10.1177/0146167203256868

Swann, W. B., Polzer, J. T., Seyle, D. C., & Ko, S. J. (2004). Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups.*Academy of Management Review*, *29*(1), 9-27. doi:10.5465/AMR.2004.11851702

Tajfel, H. E. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Oxford, England: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge university press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter. *Harvard business review*, *74*(5), 79-90. http://www.hispaniccsc.org/2007%20Summit/ Appendix/96510p2[1].pdf

Thomas, K. M. (1996). Psychological privilege and ethnocentrism as barriers to cross-cultural adjustment and effective intercultural interactions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(2), 215-228.

Thomas, K. M., & Plaut, V. C. (2008). The many faces of diversity resistance in the workplace. In Thomas, K. M. (Ed.), *Diversity resistance in organizations* (pp. 1-22). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group/Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Thomas, K.M., Mack, D.A., & Montagliani, A. (2004). The arguments against diversity: Are they valid?. In M.Stockdale & F. Crosby (Eds.), *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 31-51). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Thomas, K. M., & Chrobot-Mason, D. (2005). Demographic group based discrimination: Theories and conclusions. In R. Diboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 63-88). Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Thomas, R. R., & Woodruff, M. I. (1999). *Building a House for Diversity: How a Fable about a Giraffe & Elephant Offers New Strategies for Today's Workforce*. New York, NY: AMACOM

Todd, A. R., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Galinsky, A. D. (2011). Perspective-taking combats the denial of intergroup discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.48*(3), 738-745. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.12.011

Todd, A. R., Bodenhausen, G. V., Richeson, J. A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2011). Perspective taking combats automatic expressions of racial bias. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 100(6), 1027-1042. doi: 10.1037/a0022308

Todd, A. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). The reciprocal link between multiculturalism and perspective-taking: How ideological and self-regulatory approaches to managing diversity reinforce each other. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,48*(6), 1394-1398. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.007

Todd, A. R., Galinsky, A. D., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2012). Perspective taking undermines stereotype maintenance processes: Evidence from social memory, behavior explanation, and information solicitation. *Social Cognition, 30*(1), 94-108. doi: 10.1521/soco.2012.30.1.94

Triana, M. D. C., & García, M. F. (2009). Valuing diversity: a group‐value approach to understanding the importance of organizational efforts to support diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*(7), 941-962. doi: 10.1002/job.598

Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. A. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *38*, 1–10. doi:10.1007/BF02291170

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 549-579. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393472

Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and social psychology review*, *7*(4), 349-361. doi: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704_07

Vandenberg, R. J., & Grelle, D. M. (2009). Alternative model specifications in structural

    equation modeling: Facts, fictions, and truth. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.),

    Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends: Received doctrine, verity, and

    fable in the organizational and social sciences (p. 165-191). New York, NY: Routledge

Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance

    literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research.

    Organizational research methods, *3*(1), 4-70. doi:10.1177/109442810031002

Van Der Vegt, G. S., & Bunderson, J. S. (2005). Learning and Performance in Multidisciplinary

    Teams: The Importance of Collective Team Identification. *Academy of Management*

    Journal, *48*(3), 532-547. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2005.17407918

Van Dick, R., Grojean, M. W., Christ, O., & Wieseke, J. (2006). Identity and the extra mile:

    Relationships between organizational identification and organizational citizenship

    behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, *17*(4), 283-301. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-

    8551.2006.00520.x

Van Dick, R., Van Knippenberg, D., Hägele, S., Guillaume, Y. R., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2008).

    Group diversity and group identification: The moderating role of diversity

    beliefs. *Human Relations*, *61*(10), 1463-1492. doi: 10.1177/0018726708095711

Van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and

    group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, *89*, 1008-1022. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1008

Van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2007). Unity through diversity: Value-in-

    diversity beliefs, work group diversity, and group identification. *Group Dynamics:*

    Theory, Research, and Practice, 11(3), 207-222. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.11.3.207

Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 515-541. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085546

Van Knippenberg, D., & Van Schie, E. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *73*(2), 137-147. doi: 10.1348/096317900166949

Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *88*(1), 121-138. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121

Verkuyten, M. (2010). Assimilation ideology and situational well-being among ethnic minority members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 269-275. doi: /10.1016/j.jesp.2009.11.007

Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2006). Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.05.015

Vorauer, J. D., Gagnon, A., & Sasaki, S. J. (2009). Salient intergroup ideology and intergroup interaction. *Psychological Science*, *20*(7), 838-845. doi:doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02369.x

Waldzus, S., & Mummendey, A. (2004). Inclusion in a superordinate category, in-group prototypicality, and attitudes towards out-groups. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, *40*(4), 466-477. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.003

Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (2005). When "different" means "worse": In-group prototypicality in changing intergroup contexts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *41*(1), 76-83. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2004.05.006

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., & Zhu, W. (2008). How transformational leadership weaves its influence on individual job performance: The role of identification and efficacy beliefs. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(4), 793-825. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00131.x

Wasserman, I. C., Gallegos, P. V., & Ferdman, B. M. (2008). Dancing with resistance: Leadership challenges in fostering a culture of inclusion. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity resistance in organizations* (pp. 175-200). New York: Taylor and Francis.

Watts, R. J., & Carter, R. T. (1991). Psychological aspects of racism in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, *16*(3), 328-344. doi:10.1177/105960119101600307

Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2007). Superordinate identities and intergroup conflict: The in-group projection model. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 331-372. doi:10.1080/10463280701728302

Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., Weber, U., & Waldzus, S. (2003). The in-group as pars pro toto: Projection from the in-group onto the inclusive category as a precursor to social discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*(4), 461-473. doi: 10.1177/0146167202250913

Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. III. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. In B. Staw & R. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 20, pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the Tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research*, *19*(3), 277-306. doi:10.1007/s11211-006-0014-8

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and

individuals. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *78*(4), 635-654. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.635

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 285-305. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00013-2

Zohar, D., & Tenne-Gazit, O. (2008). Transformational leadership and group interaction as climate antecedents: a social network analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 744-754. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.744

APPENDIX A

SURVEY MEASURES

Demographic Screen

Instructions: Please provide the following demographic information.

1. Are you Hispanic or Latino?
    a. Yes
    b. No
2. What is your race/ethnicity?
    a. Asian or Asian American
    b. Black or African American
    c. White, Caucasian
    d. American Indian/Native American
    e. Multiracial
3. What is your age in years?
4. What is your employment status?
    a. Full-time
    b. Part-time
    c. Unemployed
5. Are you employed in the United States of America?
    a. Yes
    b. No

Demographic Questionnaire

Instructions: Please provide the following demographic information.

1. What is your gender?
    a. Male
    b. Female
    c. Transgender
2. Are you employed in a management position?
    a. Management
    b. Non-Management
3. How long have you been employed by your current organization?
    a. Less than 1 year
    b. 1-5 years
    c. 6-10 years
    d. 11-15 years
    e. 16-20 years
    f. 21-30 years
    g. Over 30 years
4. What is the length of your relationship with your immediate supervisor?
    a. Less than 1 year

      b. 1-5 years
      c. 6-10 years
      d. 11-15 years
      e. 16-20 years
      f. 21-30 years
      g. Over 30 years

5. What is the race of your immediate supervisor?
   a. Asian or Asian American
   b. Black or African American
   c. Hispanic or Latino
   d. White, Caucasian, not Hispanic
   e. American Indian/Native American

6. Which is the highest educational degree that you hold?
   a. Less than college or no degree
   b. Associate
   c. Bachelor's
   d. Master's
   e. Ph.D. / DSW, etc. (doctorate, non-medical)
   f. M.D. or other medical degree

7. What best describes your occupational field?
   a. Business and financial
   b. Computer and mathematical
   c. Architecture and engineering
   d. Life, physical, and social science
   e. Community and social services
   f. Legal
   g. Education, training, and library
   h. Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media
   i. Health care practitioners and technical
   j. Health care support
   k. Protective service
   l. Food preparation and serving related
   m. Personal care and service
   n. Sales and related
   o. Office and administrative support
   p. Farming, fishing, and forestry
   q. Construction and extraction
   r. Installation, maintenance, and repair
   s. Production
   t. Transportation and material moving
   u. Military specific

Multicultural Competency

Instructions: Judge how frequently each statement fits your immediate supervisor. If an item is irrelevant, please leave it blank. Use the scale: 0=not at all, 1=once in a while, 2=sometimes, 3=fairly often, 4=frequently, if not always. My immediate supervisor…

1. Point out if others use language that may be offensive to members of certain demographic groups.
2. Confront those who tell jokes that are offensive to members of other demographic groups.
3. Question comments that appear to promote prejudice or stereotypes.
4. Coach others to confront stereotypes or biases if they are affecting working relationships.
5. Ask questions about the preferred terminology in referring to diverse groups.
6. Discuss the demographics of your work group, task forces or project teams.
7. Ask diverse co-workers to identify aspects of your behavior that hinder the development of work relationships.
8. Openly discuss issues of race, gender, and other diversity concerns.
9. Seek opportunities to work with members of diverse demographic groups.
10. Ask members of diverse demographic groups for their views and ideas.
11. Look for instances where members of other demographic groups are overlooked and take action to get them involved.

Organizational Identification

Instructions: Please answer as honestly as possible the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. When someone praises my organization, it feels like a personal compliment.
2. When someone criticizes my organization, it feels like a personal insult.
3. I am very interested in what others think about my organization.
4. When I talk about my organization, I usually say "we" rather than "they".
5. My organization's successes are my successes.
6. If a story in the media criticized my organization, I would feel embarrassed.

Façade of Conformity

Instructions: Please answer as honestly as possible the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. I don't share certain things about myself and my culture in order to fit in at work.
2. I suppress my personal values that are different from those of the organization.
3. I withhold personal values that conflict with organizational values.
4. I don't "play politics" at work by pretending to embrace organizational values.
5. I behave in a manner that reflects the organization's value system even though it is inconsistent with my personal values.
6. I say things I don't really believe at work.

Organizational Colorblindness

Instructions: Please answer as honestly as possible the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. My organization believes that despite cultural differences, we are really all the same when it comes to working.
2. My organization believes we should not acknowledge racial-ethnic difference because we are really all the same.
3. My organization treats everyone the same no matter what their ethnicity is.
4. My organization believes it is best to judge one another as individuals rather than as members of an ethnic group.
5. To encourage unity, my organization believes individuals should be considered as members of the organization before consideration is given to their ethnicity.
6. My organization believes that recognizing different ethnic backgrounds can be a recipe for trouble.

Organizational Multiculturalism

Instructions: Please answer as honestly as possible the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. My organization thinks positively about cultural differences of colleagues.
2. My organization understands and accepts different cultures.
3. My organization recommends working with people with cultural different backgrounds.
4. Differences in cultural backgrounds are discussed openly by my organization.
5. My organization takes differences in traditions and habits (like religion, cultural celebrations) into account.
6. My organization sees the advantage of differences in cultural backgrounds of employees.

Racial-ethic Identification

Instructions: Please answer as honestly as possible the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.
2. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.
3. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
4. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.
5. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.
6. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.
7. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

Organizational Efforts to Support Diversity

Instructions: Please answer as honestly as possible the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. My organization has sponsored classes, workshops, and/or seminars on diversity.
2. My organization puts a lot of effort into diversity management.
3. My organization spends enough money and time on diversity awareness and related training.

Perceived Similarity

What percentage of your organization is similar to you in race-ethnicity?