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Abstract

Integrating affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), the frame switching model (Hong, Morris, Chiu, Benet-Martinez, 2000) and social identity theory (Tajfel, Flament, Billing, & Bundy, 1971; Tajfel, 1974; Turner, Brown, & Tajfel 1979; Tajfel, 1981), I argue that biculturalism is both positively associated with emotional ambivalence and attitudes toward diversity. I also hypothesize that bicultural identity integration (BII) is negatively associated with emotional ambivalence and moderates the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. Finally, emotional ambivalence partially mediates the relationship between biculturalism and attitudes toward diversity. I conducted two studies in a South-Western university in the US. Participants were invited to answer on-line surveys, and they receive gift certificates in return for their participation. In one of the studies, I also invited participants’ significant others to answer an online survey. Both studies indicated that there is a negative relationship between bicultural identity integration and emotional ambivalence. No moderation effects of bicultural identity integration in the first study was found, but the second study showed conditional effects of bicultural identity integration. The positive relationship between biculturalism and attitudes toward diversity was supported in only one study. The results from the two studies indicated that there is no positive relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. Finally, there was no indirect effects between biculturalism and attitudes toward diversity in both studies. I discuss the contributions and the implications of the findings.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The level of international immigration is increasing rapidly due to economic, political, and social reasons (Brannen & Thomas, 2010; Hong, Wan, No, Chiu, 2007). Furthermore, due to numerous factors such as new technologies for transportation and communication, globalization, travel, war, political oppression, economic differences, free trade, internet, and international migration, it is becoming easier to interact with individuals who are culturally different (Rickard, 1994). Because of the higher exposure to others from different cultures, many individuals are internalizing two or more cultures leading to an increase in the number of bicultural individuals (Nguyen, & Benet-Martinez, 2012). For instance, based on the 2010 census, there are nearly 40 million individuals (13% of the population) who are categorized as “foreign born” residing in the United States. The U.S. census defined foreign born as “anyone who is not a U.S. citizen at birth,” which includes naturalized citizens, permanent residents, refugees, and undocumented migrants (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The foreign born from Latin America constitute the largest group currently living in the United States (53.1%), with Mexico having the highest share (29.3%) out of the 40 million estimated, not including their off-spring because they are U.S. born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Furthermore, it is expected that by the year 2040 more than 50% of the U.S. population will be comprised of ethnic minorities either U.S. born or foreign-born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008a). This phenomenon is also common in Europe due to the low birth rate of the European population and the rapid increase of the non-European born population (Brannen, Garcia, & Thomas, 2009).

Giving the increasing number of biculturals in the United States and around the world, it becomes important to understand how these individuals think and feel about others at work. Current theoretical and empirical work indicates that biculturals understand the norms, ways of
thinking, and attitudes common within two cultural knowledge systems (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Hong, Wan, No, & Chiu, 2007). Such knowledge can benefit many multinational corporations (MNCs), as they are facing a lot of challenges in functioning effectively in multicultural work settings where a high level of intercultural coordination and collaboration is required (Brannen et al., 2009). Brannen et al. (2009) also suggested that the growing population of biculturals can bring to work settings latent abilities to bridge the disconnection among different cultures. In this respect, I argue that biculturals can develop high level of positive attitudes with diverse others.

There is a dearth of research that examines the effects of biculturalism in work settings (Brannen et al, 2009; Brannen & Thomas, 2010). Therefore, it is imperative that further theoretical and empirical investigations are carried out to examine the different features and characteristics that bicultural employees possess and how these characteristics impact emotions and different attitudinal outcomes (e.g. attitude toward diversity) in work settings.

Current research indicates that biculturals switch their identities as a response to different environmental and social cues (Hong et al., 2000), but little is known about how this frame switching relates to emotions and work attitudes. I argue that biculturals experiencing emotional ambivalence, simultaneous experience of two colliding emotions, can be more alert and sensitive to these different cues as they are accustomed to experiencing different cultural cues. Additionally, on a daily basis biculturals are dealing internally with diverse cultures (Hong et al., 2000), which may affect the way they perceive diversity in general. Therefore, I seek here to investigate emotional ambivalence and how this particular state affects attitudes towards diversity, or perceptions towards others different than oneself. In addition, I examine how emotional ambivalence mediates the relationship between biculturalism and attitudes toward
diversity, which is important to uncover the process of reconciling cultural differences and understanding how positive attitudes toward diversity may result. I also argue that bicultural identity integration (BII) moderates the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence.

BII refers to how biculturals differ on how much they perceive the two cultures they identify with as complimentary versus oppositional (Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002). Past research has concluded that bicultural identity integration (BII) is an important factor to understand as it captures how individuals view themselves compared others, which may ultimately affect their success while working in intercultural settings (e.g. Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, Lee, 2008). For instance, Cheng et al. (2008) found that higher level of identity integration predicts higher level of performance creativity. Furthermore, there are differences among biculturals in relation to sociocultural, socio-cognitive, and socio-emotional factors leaving significant differences in the formation of bicultural identity integration and subsequently its effects (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). In this dissertation I argue that bicultural identity integration moderates the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence, which eventually will influence the relationship between emotional ambivalence and attitudes toward diversity.

I build the rationale for my model drawing and integrating three theories: social identity theory (Turner, Brown & Tajfel, 1979; Tajfel, 1981), the frame switching model (Hong et al., 2000) and affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Social identity theory is instrumental in explaining how biculturals identify themselves with two distinct groups, whereas the premises of the frame switching model help in clarifying how and why biculturals switch between two different cultures. Affective events theory provides the rationale to understand how
different social and environmental cues associated with both cultures facing biculturals on a daily basis influence emotions and how that in turn affects attitudinal outcomes (i.e., attitudes toward diversity). The proposed model involves three major aspects: (1) identity formation, (2) identity switching, and (3) how emotions relate to this identity formation and switching to explain attitudes towards diversity.

In this study I make several theoretical contributions, particularly in relation to emotional ambivalence. I draw, integrate and expand the frame switching model and affective events theory in explaining how emotional ambivalence is associated with biculturalism. Previous literature on ambivalence has examined the role of ambivalent attitudes towards minorities (Bagozzi, Wong, & Youjae, 1999), but to my knowledge there is no work examining the experience of emotional ambivalence among bicultural individuals.

Second, using the lenses of social identity theory, I explain how biculturals have high level of positive attitudes towards diversity. Third, I examine emotional ambivalence as the mediator of the relationship between being bicultural and having positive attitudes towards diversity. In summary, in this study I explain the relationship between identity, emotions, and attitudes of bicultural individuals in work settings by explaining why positive attitudes towards diversity are more likely to occur with biculturals. This contribution responds to a call for research to focus not only on outcomes but also on the processes that lead to the proposed outcomes (Weick, 1989). In examining these relationships, I take into consideration bicultural identity integration (BII) as a main boundary condition establishing limits to the generalizability of the theoretical model.

The proposed model can be considered as builder rather than a reporter or tester because it introduces new constructs: emotional ambivalence and BII in a newly investigated context.
This study helps to better understand the processes biculturals undergo when developing their emotions and how affect eventually impacts their attitudes. Rather than testing models proposed earlier in the literature, I am building upon prior theoretical frameworks in understanding how and why biculturalism relates to emotions and attitudes to diversity in work settings.

Finally, in this study I also offer a practical contribution. I collected empirical evidence that is instrumental in helping managers appreciate the value associated with bicultural individuals in diverse work settings.

1.1 Organization of the study

In the first chapter, the introduction, I highlight the main objective of the study. Five more chapters follow the introduction including references and appendixes.

In Chapter 2, I develop a comprehensive literature review for attitudes toward diversity, biculturalism, acculturation, emotional ambivalence, and bicultural identity integration (BII) emphasizing theoretical and empirical gaps.

In Chapter 3, I present a review for the three theories used in this study: social identity theory, frame switching model, and affective events theory. In addition, I develop a rationale for the main hypotheses of the model.

In Chapter 4, I describe the sample of the two studies, the design of the studies, and the procedures, and the measures I used to quantify the data. I also explain the statistical analysis and the results of the two studies.

In Chapter 5, I discuss the analysis of both studies which includes the preliminary analysis, the samples characteristics and model fit. Finally, in Chapter 6, I discuss the results of my
research, the theoretical, practical, methodological, and societal implications of my research as well as the limitations and future research. Table 8 provides a summary of all the definitions used in this dissertation.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Attitude toward Diversity

2.1.1 Definition and Conceptualization

Attitude toward diversity is defined as “the degree to which one tends to accept minorities, primarily women and non-whites, in the work-place” (Montei, Adams & Eggers, 1996, p. 295). Specifically, Montei et al. (1996) examined attitudes toward having a minority supervisor, attitudes toward having a minority coworker, and attitudes toward promoting and hiring minorities.

Another way of conceptualizing attitudes towards diversity is based on cognitions, behaviors, and feelings. Scholars examined attitudes toward diversity based on three components: (a) realistic appreciation (a cognitive component), (b) diversity of contact (a behavioral component), and (c) comfort with differences (a feelings component; Miville, Gelso, Pannu, Liu, Touradji, Holloway, & Fuertes, 1999; Fuertes, 2000a; & Strauss & Connerley, 2003).

Attitudes toward diversity have also received different names. Scholars like Miville et al. (1999) investigated what they called “universal diverse orientation,” which relates to attitudes of acceptance of dissimilar others. They defined it as “an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both the similarities and differences among people” (Miville et al., 1999, p.291). Acknowledging the universal similarities that exist among human beings connects people whereas recognizing the different characteristics of people because of cultural and individual differences generate unique aspects among people (Strauss & Sawyer, 2009). Therefore, universal diverse orientation is a general definition of diversity that emphasizes the differences as well as the similarities among people in a holistic manner. Multiple studies used attitudes toward diversity and universal diverse orientation interchangeably indicating that they are
conceptually similar (e.g., Strauss & Connerley, 2003; Sawyerr et al. 2005; Strauss & Sawyer, 2009).

Another construct similar to attitudes towards diversity is perception of complexity toward workplace diversity (Hostager & De Meuse, 2002). This construct is defined as the degree to which “an individual’s view of diversity is differentiated among five different dimensions of diversity reactions: emotional, behavioral, judgment, personal consequences, and organizational outcomes” (Hostager & De Meuse, 2002) p.192). They assessed the perceptions of complexity toward workplace diversity based on three components: (a) perceptual breadth (focuses on the range of one’s perception), (b) perceptual depth (degree to which an individual’s diversity perceptions are differentiated), and (c) perceptual balance (the differentiated view of positive and negative aspects of the individual’s diversity perceptions).

In summary, attitudes toward diversity have been conceptualized differently by different scholars. In this study I will follow the Miville et al. (1999) definition that focused on the acceptance of dissimilar others. Dissimilar others can represent a wide variety of different demographics and cultural identifications.

2.1.2 Attitudes toward diversity: Antecedents, Outcomes, & Moderation effects

One of the main goals of my research is to examine the factors that explain attitudes toward diversity. Various studies have looked into this issue and considered the impact of gender-role beliefs (Strauss, Connerley, Ammermann, 2003; Whitley & Egisdotter, 2000), racial prejudice (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999), degree of exposure to diversity (Strauss and Connerley, 2003), personality variables (Strauss et al., 2003; Thompson, Brossart, Carlozzi, & Miville, 2002) and religion (Strauss & Sawyer, 2009).
In general, attitudes toward diversity are mainly driven by individual differences such as gender, race, and personality (Homan, Hollenbeck, Humphery, Kinppenberg, Ilgen, & Van Kleef, 2008; Strauss & Connerley, 2003). These differences will ultimately impact peoples’ ability to effectively interact with others (Strauss & Connerley, 2003). For instance, openness to experience among teams as well as individuals was found, more than the other four factors in the five factor model, to be positively related to attitudes toward diversity (Caligiuri, 2000; Ekehammar and Akrami, 2003; Flynn, 2005; & Homan et al., 2008). Thompson et al. (2002) found that experiences of aesthetic diversity (appreciating art and beauty) as a particular dimension of openness to experience is strongly related to universal diverse orientation. Agreeableness, on the other hand, was also found to be positively related to attitudes toward diversity as well as universal diverse orientation (Strauss and Connerley, 2003; Strauss et al, 2003). Strauss et al. (2003) found also that tolerance for ambiguity, but not openness to experience, was positively related to attitudes toward diversity.

Another personality characteristic, authoritarianism, was found to be negatively related to attitudes toward diversity (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993; Strauss et al., 2003). Whitley & Ægisdotter (2000) found also that authoritarianism and gender-role beliefs significantly explained attitudes toward homosexual individuals where individuals with high authoritarianism and traditional gender-role beliefs tended to condemn homosexuality more than those with a lower authoritarianism level and non-traditional gender-role beliefs. Individuals with higher authoritarian scores tended to be in general more prejudiced towards out-group members (Whitley & Ægisdotter, 2000).

Other individual characteristics, such as awareness of racial issues and ethnocultural empathy were found to be related to attitudes toward diversity. Buttner, Lowe, and Billing
(2006) found that business schools deans’ awareness of racial issues leads to more positive attitude toward diversity. Hostager & De Meuse (2002) also found that managers exhibited higher levels of complexity toward diversity compared with both employees and students who participated in the study. According to their findings, a higher level of complexity indicates that managers are more likely to have positive attitudes toward diversity compared to employees and students. Ethnocultural empathy (empathy toward people from different ethnic backgrounds) was also found to be positively related to attitudes toward diversity and it also mediated the relationship between intergroup contact and positive attitudes toward diversity (Brouwer & Boros, 2010).

Various values and demographic characteristics were also found to be significantly related to universal diverse orientation. For instance, Sawyer et al. (2005) found that self-transcendence (i.e. equality), conservation (i.e. conformity), and openness to change values were positively related to universal diverse orientation. They also found that the value of self-enhancement (i.e. achievement and power) is negatively related to positive universal diverse orientation. In addition to these values, individuals with interdependent self-construal rather than independent self-construal and those who had exposure to multicultural workshops were found to have a high positive universal-diverse orientation (Yeh & Arora, 2003; Weisman & Garza, 2010).

Demographic characteristics and demographic composition are also associated with attitudes towards diversity. Kossek & Zonia (1993) examined the combined effects of group characteristics (i.e., race, and gender) and contextual factors (i.e. race heterogeneity and resource support for minorities) in understanding the attitudes toward qualifications of women and attitudes toward qualifications of racioethnic minorities on a faculty sample at a large university.
Kossek & Zonia (1993) found that respondent's racioethnicity significantly accounted for the positive attitudes toward qualifications of racioethnic minorities. Compared to whites, racioethnic minorities rated the qualifications of racioethnic minorities higher. Regarding the attitudes toward the qualifications of women, the authors found that white men had higher ratings for the qualifications of women than female racioethnic minorities. Women, on the other hand, rated the qualifications of women higher than men. Kossek & Zonia (1993) found also that higher positive attitudes toward the qualifications of women are more likely to happen when women are greater in number than men (gender heterogeneity). Barak, Cherin, & Berkman (1998) found also that white women and racial/ethnic minorities had higher positive perceptions toward diversity than Caucasian men.

As far as the religion, Strauss & Sawyer (2009) examined the relationships between two measures of religiosity: immanence orientation and religious fundamentalism, and two measures of attitudes toward diversity: attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and universal-diverse orientation. Religious fundamentalism calls for strictly following unchangeable practices of the past whereas immanence orientation is characterized with motivation to transcend religious boundaries (Strauss & Sawyer, 2009). They found that high level of immanence orientation was associated with more positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and universal diverse orientation whereas high level of religious fundamentalism was negatively related to both attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and universal diverse orientation.

Aside from the antecedents, different outcomes can be influenced by attitudes toward diversity as well. Fuertes and Gelso (1998) found that students with higher positive attitudes toward diversity were more willing to accept counselors from different racial groups. It was also found that people with higher positive attitudes toward diversity are more comfortable in dealing
effectively with diverse groups (Montei et al., 1996; Strauss et al, 2003). Nakui, Paulus, & Zee (2011), on the other hand, found direct positive effects between attitudes toward diversity and psychological reactions (i.e. motivation to work and enjoyment) as well as task performance. Helm, Sedlacek, & Prieto (1998) found in a student’s sample that negative attitudes toward diversity derived from racial tension and lack of support from faculty were negatively correlated with satisfaction levels of students from different racial backgrounds. Finally, Fuertes & Gelso (1998) found that students with low universal diverse orientation show more preferences for a psychologist with a similar personality to their own than those with high universal diverse orientation.

As for the moderation effects, Nakui et al. (2011) found that positive attitudes toward diversity moderate the relationship between diversity among students and the quality of ideas from a brainstorm session. They found that high scores of attitudes toward diverse workgroups positively enhance the relationship between diversity (especially with high level) and brainstorming performance as well as positive psychological reactions compared to low scores of attitudes toward diverse workgroups. On the other hand, Fuertes & Gelso (1998) found that universal-diverse orientation moderates the relationship between racioethnicity and the importance of choosing a psychologist with similar characteristics. They found that Asian-Americans with high scores in universal diverse orientation place less importance in finding a psychologist with similar characteristics compared to those with lower scores in universal diverse orientation (i.e. race and gender).

In summary, considering the previous studies that examined attitudes toward diversity as an antecedent or a moderator, it is clear that there is a lot to explore about this construct. For instance, among the previous studies, I did not find any research that looked at the relationship
between being bicultural and attitudes toward diversity. In addition, most of the research related to attitudes toward diversity has emphasized demographic, cognitive, and behavioral explanations. So far, researchers have not explained how emotions relate to demographic characteristics or the integration of emotions and cognitions in understanding attitudes towards diversity. Therefore, understanding how bicultural individuals react to dissimilar others while taking into consideration culture, cognition, and emotions will provide a better theoretical representation and practical recommendations.

2.1.3 Attitude toward Diversity: General Theories

Several theories have been used to explain the antecedents, outcomes, and moderators of attitudes toward diversity. For instance, Strauss and Connerley (2003) as well as Flynn (2005) asserted that the level of contact or exposure to diversity plays a significant role in determining the attitudes toward others with diverse backgrounds. This assertion is derived from the contact hypothesis that postulates that the interaction with individuals from diverse cultural background results in a more positive attitude toward them (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969). Brouwer & Boros (2010) also utilized the contact hypothesis to rationalize the relationship between ethnocultural empathy and positive attitudes toward diversity. They asserted that contact in a diverse workplace will give an opportunity for members from different racial backgrounds to intermingle and build up positive relationships which will eventually lead to positive intergroup attitudes.

Other researchers, such as Kossek and Zonia (1993) as well as Barak et al. (1998), used intergroup theory (Alderfer, 1986) to explain the positive relationship between racioethnicity and attitudes toward qualifications of racioethnic minorities and women as well as the relationship between gender and attitudes toward qualifications of women. They indicated that the perception of social attraction is based on group membership. Groups’ memberships are either based on
identity groups (based on sex and race) or organizational groups (based on job function and position). These group memberships can influence the perception toward other groups and the level of interaction with them. Therefore, positive attitudes toward diversity can be attributed to the increased heterogeneity in the work environment (i.e. gender and racio-ethnicity). That can be justified due to the fact that racioethnic groups welcome more diversity in the workplace compared to others since such change can directly benefit them (Kossek & Zonia, 1993).

Furthermore, intergroup processes control how members of a group deal with others and how they are dealt with, which eventually shape perceptions and determine social realisms (Wells, 1990).

Strauss & Sawyer (2009) utilized similarity-attraction theory (Byrne, 1971) to explain the relationship between religiosity (religious fundamentalism and immanence orientation) and attitudes toward gay men and lesbians as well as religiosity and universal diverse orientation. They found that individuals have preferences toward similar others depending on the religiosity and that it mainly reinforces their self-identities and prevents the threat associated with dissimilar others. For instance, people with high immanence orientation tend to have more positive UDO attitudes and more positive attitudes toward homosexual than those with low immanence orientation. By the same token, people with high level of religious fundamentalism tend to have more negative UDO attitudes and more negative attitudes as well toward homosexual than those with low religious fundamentalism.

Furthermore, positive or negative attitudes toward diversity have been also explained using self-categorization theory (Turner, 1982; Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992) or the broader theory of social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner’s, 1979; Tajfel, 1981). One of the main tenets of social identity theory asserts that positive evaluation of the in-group (in-group bias) and the
negative attitudes toward out-groups can cause discrimination and prejudice to increase. People like to think of themselves and others as members of different groups instead of just being unique individuals (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011). Individuals strive to maintain a positive social identity because that will affect their self-esteem, “the need for distinctiveness” (Tajfel, 1975). For instance, Romero & Roberts (1998) found that negative attitudes toward out-groups predict higher levels of perception of discrimination, as individuals with negative attitudes toward other groups may possess higher needs for distinctiveness and hence tend to discriminate against others.

In summary, the theories used to examine attitudes towards diversity emphasize cognitive and/or behavioral explanations. There is a need to examine how emotions are associated with attitudes toward diversity because emotions explain variance in attitudes beyond cognitions and demographic characteristics (Allen, Machleit, & Kleine, 1992; Keltner & Lerner, 1992).

2.2 Biculturalism

2.2.1 Biculturalism: Definition and Conceptualization

Many definitions of biculturalism were introduced in the literature where some are based on specific aspects such as cultural orientation and others are based on general aspects such as demographic characteristics (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2007). Bicultural individuals are those who have been exposed to and internalized two distinct cultures where both cultures are alive inside them (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000). This study will draw from this definition as it emphasizes biculturals’ exposure to both cultures. Bicultural individuals include immigrants, ethnic minorities, refugees, indigenous peoples, sojourners, etc. (Berry, 2003; Padilla & Perez, 2003). The knowledge of both cultures is driven by the internalization of the cultural schemas associated with the multiple
cultures (LaFromboise et al., 1993) as well as the “cognitive access to the two different cultural knowledge traditions” biculturals have (Friedman and Liu, 2009, p.335). A cultural schema represents the knowledge of values, beliefs, attitudes, and attributes of the multiple cultures (Fiske & Taylor, 1984). Another important aspect of biculturalism is the ability to switch between the two cultures as a response to cultural cues associated with the two internalized cultures (Hong et al., 2000).

Biculturalism has been compared to other concepts that are related but slightly different. For instance, Brannen & Thomas (2010) differentiated between cultural knowledge and cultural identification where the latter is concerned with answering the question of “who am I? with reference to a set of beliefs, attitudes, values, and behavioral assumptions” (p.6). Cultural knowledge, on the other hand, entails only the opportunity to gain some knowledge about the culture (i.e. international students and tourism) but not necessarily identifying with the culture. Biculturals tend to identify with two cultures rather than having a mere knowledge of the two cultures (Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997). Friedman and Liu (2009), on the other hand, differentiated between cultural intelligence and biculturalism as the former refers to “person’s capability to adapt effectively to new cultural contexts” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p.9), whereas the latter is the internalization of two distinct cultures where both cultures are alive (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; Hong et al., 2000) and these individuals have the ability to shift between the two cultural systems (Berry, 1980; & LaFromboise et al, 1993). These cultural systems or cultural meaning systems refer to the “interpretative frames that affect individuals’ affect, cognition, and behavior” (Hong, Chiu, & Kung, 1997).

Biculturalism is also different from acculturation where biculturalism refers to learning two cultures simultaneously (Birman, 1994; Padilla, 2006), whereas acculturation is a broader
concept that indicates the conjunction of two cultural systems and this conjunction takes different forms (Social Science Research Council, 1954). However, biculturalism can be considered one strategy of acculturation, which is the most adaptive to the combination of any two cultural systems and the most conducive to psychological well-being (Berry, 2003) because biculturalism can be freely chosen by the individual from the non-dominant group with no enforcement from the dominant group (Berry, 1990). Furthermore, biculturalism has been equated to the integration strategy, one of the four acculturation strategies (e.g., Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2012; Tadmor and Tetlock, 2006), yet others consider the two strategies (biculturalism & integration) as dissimilar (i.e. Brannen and Thomas, 2010). According to Berry (1997), integration is defined as “maintaining one’s original culture, while in daily interactions with the other groups” (p.9). In this study, the two terms (biculturalism & integration) are viewed similarly as I believe that they both emphasize the simultaneous internalization of the ethnic as well as the mainstream cultures.

Another construct that is similar to biculturalism is bicultural competence which refers to “the ability to be a socially competent person in the second culture without losing the same competence in the culture of origin” (LaFromboise et al., 1993, p.408). A biculturally competent individual is assumed to internalize, appreciate, and know the basic beliefs, values, communication means and cultural efficacy of two particular cultures (LaFromboise, 1993). A reported difference between the construct of biculturalism and bicultural competence is that the biculturalism literature focuses consistently in the different forms of psychological distress associated with individuals living within two cultures (LaFromboise et al., 1993)

In addition to bicultural competence, LaFromboise et al. (1993) discussed alternation and fusion models that represent two different modes of biculturalism. Based on the alternation
model (LaFrombosie et al., 1993), biculturals alternate their behaviors based on cues from the social environment. Hong et al. (2000) attempted to clarify this model by presenting the concept of “frame switching” among biculturals. Frame switching means that bicultural’s internalized cultures alternate in controlling his or her thoughts and behaviors (LaFromboise et al., 1993). This is an indication that internalized cultures are not blended together but separate, and absorbing the new culture does not mean abandoning the original one (Hong et al., 2000). This cultural frame switching may occur due to the presentation of cues and symbols related to each culture. The fusion model, on the other hand, suggests that the two cultures will melt together forming a new culture.

Recently, Fitzsimmons (2013) introduced a new model for multicultural identity based on two factors (identity integration & identity plurality). She defined multicultural individuals as “those who internalized two or more cultural schemas” (p. 526). Bicultural individuals differ from multiculturals as they only internalize two distinct cultures. Based on these two factors, four new patterns of multiculturals were introduced: prioritizing, aggregating, hybridizing, and compartmentalizing. She suggested that these different patterns are not categories but rather continuous patterns. Prioritizing multiculturals are those who organize their internalized identities in a hierarchal way where one of them is highly accessible compared to the rest. Aggregating multiculturals, on the other hand, internalized various numbers of identities, but they value them equally unlike prioritizing multiculturals. Multiculturals who consider their identities to be separated and only identify with one identity at each time are called “compartmentalizing multiculturals.” Finally, hybridizing multiculturals refers to those multiculturals who see their different internalized identities as integrated and these identities are highly accessible.
Based on this model, I can see that aggregating multiculturals share some characteristics with bicultural individuals in the sense of internalizing more than one culture with no prioritization of one culture over the other. Fitzsimmons (2103) considered aggregating multiculturals to be also similar to merged identities (Rocca & Brewer, 2002) and fused identities (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). As for the identity integration dimension that includes hybridizing and compartmentalizing, these two patterns are conceptually similar to the construct of bicultural identity integration introduced by Benet-Martinez et al. (2002), which will be discussed later. Hybridizing multiculturals are similar to biculturals with high levels of BII (bicultural identity integration) whereas the compartmentalizing multiculturals are similar to biculturals with low BII.

Other researchers have focused on exploring the different possible typologies of biculturalism (e.g. Ramirez, 1984; Birman, 1994, Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997; Hong et al., 2007). On a sample of African-American and Mexican-American adolescents, Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) found three different bicultural identifications: blended biculturals (having an identity emerging from the overlap between the two cultures), alternating biculturals (having an alternating identity between the ethnic and the American), and separated biculturals (having strong ethnic identification and no identification with the larger society). On the other hand, Birman (1994; 1998) found four different forms of bicultural individuals: blended (feeling positive about both cultures), instrumental (knowing both cultures but identifying with neither), explorers (familiarized with the dominant culture but identifying only with the ethnic culture), and integrated (identifying with both cultures). Finally, Hong et al. (2007) enumerated three different modes of how individuals go about negotiating their identities: integration, alternation, and synergy. The last mode refers to forming a new identity that cannot be traced back to either
the original or the dominant cultures. As Fitzsimmons (2013) suggested in her model, this study will not categorize individuals as biculturals and monoculturals, but rather will evaluate those who will score high in biculturalism as opposed to those who will score low.

In summary, previous models, and constructs highlighted the different possible paths individuals go through when interacting with more than one culture. Berry’s framework (Berry 1990, 2003) of acculturation and specifically how he conceptualized integration and LaFromboise et al., 1993 alternation model seems to be two appropriate models that can be used as basis for this study. The reason behind choosing these two models can be attributed to their suitability in explaining how integrating and alternating between two sets of cultural schema can subsequently affect the elicitation of various emotions (i.e., emotional ambivalence). Another reason for emphasizing into these models is that fact that biculturals competence is developed through learning the cultural’s knowledge systems of two different cultures (Hong et al., 2000; Hong et al., 2007) and that can be seen in both models.

2.2.2 Review of Acculturation Literature

Compared with the management literature, the psychology and sociology literature contains numerous studies about biculturalism as part of acculturation strategies (Brannen & Thomas, 2010). Biculturalism and acculturation are linked together (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2012), and biculturalism is considered to be one of the four ways to acculturate (Rudmin, 2003; Nguyen and Benet-Martínez, 2007; Tadmor and Tetlock, 2006).

Therefore, to better understand biculturalism and its possible outcomes in the workplace, it is important to shed some light into the acculturation literature that explains the evolution and adaptation processes of immigrants in new cultures. Graves (1967, p. 337) defined acculturation as “changes that an individual experiences as a result of being in contact with other cultures and
as a result of participating in the process of acculturation that one’s cultural or ethnic group is undergoing.”

As one of the acculturation strategies, Berry (1990) explained the factors that affect this choice of strategy and indicated that a bicultural has to deal with two issues when choosing an identity: (1) the level of motivation to retain the ethnic culture and (2) the level of motivation to adopt the mainstream culture. Berry (1997, 2003) called these issues cultural maintenance (the extent of how much they can maintain their ethnic culture), and contact and participation (the extent of how much they get involved with the dominant culture).

According to Berry (1980; 1990; 1997; 2003), there are four acculturation strategies: assimilation, integration (or biculturalism), separation, and marginalization. When individuals try to abandon their heritage culture and immerse themselves in the mainstream culture, they are using an assimilation strategy (Berry, 1990, 2003). When individuals tend to value their heritage culture and at the same time avoid immersing themselves in the new culture, they are using a separation strategy and according to Rudmin (2003) and Gillespie, McBride, and Riddle (2010), this strategy is called primacultural approach. However, when people are interested in maintaining both cultures by interacting with others from both cultures, they are using an integration strategy. Finally, when people try to disassociate themselves from both the original and the mainstream culture, then they are using a marginalization strategy, and they are considered to be culturally independent individuals (Rudmin, 2003; Gillespie et al., 2010). It should be also noted here that acculturation may occur unevenly across different aspects of life (Berry, 1990). For instance, an immigrant may strive only for an economic assimilation through work, or language assimilation through knowing the language of the dominant culture (bilingualism). Figure 3.1 depicts the four different strategies.
Many acculturation studies relied on a one-dimensional paradigm which asserts that the individual adopts the new culture and gradually abandon the former culture (e.g., Gillespie et al., 2010). This approach was criticized by some researchers (e.g., Rudmin, 2003; Rudmin, 1996) as biculturals may endorse two, three, or even four forms of acculturation. Another recent criticism against the acculturation literature is that it did not investigate the possible effects of cultural conflict (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). However, beside the acculturation taxonomy by Berry and his colleagues, there were many other classifications of the different possible strategies for acculturation. Based on his review of acculturation literature, Rudmin (2003) found about 68 typologies from various fields like anthropology, psychology, and sociology between 1918 and 1984. He and other researchers (e.g., Boski & Kwast-Welfeld, 1998, & Weinreich, 1998) criticized Berry’s paradigm because it was ineffective in explaining the differences between both members and groups acculturation processes and it also lacked the psychological and the cultural content that influence the type of acculturation chosen. Recently, Fitzsimmons (2013) introduced a model that explains four different patterns of acculturation or what she calls multiculturalism, as explained earlier. Her model addressed the cons associated with Berry’s model as she relied in more than one factor (identity integration & identity plurality) to explain the different possible strategies multiculturals undertake when forming their identities. However, her model focused mainly on multiculturals whereas the focus of this study is biculturals.

In addition to the four paradigms of acculturation, LaFromboise et al. (1993) presented five different models that explain the transition processes among different cultures: assimilation, alternation, multiculturalism, acculturation, and fusion. Some of these models, such as assimilation and multiculturalism (similar to integration), are similar to the four-fold paradigms model presented by Berry and his colleagues. The acculturation model differs from the
assimilation model as it indicates that a bicultural individual will be competent within the majority culture and still identify with the ethnic culture. Assimilation is when an individual abandons the original cultural identity while trying to develop a new cultural identity. The alternation model, on the other hand, indicates that a bicultural person belongs to two different cultures and is capable of altering his or her behaviors to fit a specific context. The fusion model suggests that the two cultures will melt together forming a new culture and that might not be the case with biculturals as they retain both cultures.

An additional model that is important to briefly discuss is Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, and Senecel (1997) model. Bourhis et al. (1997) introduced what is called “the interactive acculturation model” that considered three elements in coming up with an acculturation typology: a) acculturation perspectives of the immigrant groups, b) acculturation perspectives of the host community, and c) interpersonal and intergroup relationships. The first element produced five different acculturation orientations: integration, assimilation, separation, anomie, and individualism. The second element had five dimensions as well: integration, assimilation, segregation, exclusion, and individualism. Some of the dimensions are similar in both elements as these elements addresses the perspectives of both immigrants and host community. Bourhis et al. model differs from the previous models of acculturation in that it takes the acculturation orientation of the host community in consideration.

Based on the previous section, various models explained the means through which individuals combining two or more cultures. First, there is a general acceptance of Berry’s paradigm of the different acculturation strategies, particularly the integration strategy. However, not all the four acculturation strategies are well accepted by researchers. For example, recently researchers (e.g., Fitzsimmons, 2013) manifested opposition to marginalization as an
acculturation strategy because it seems socially unacceptable to claim that biculturals suffer from their multiple identities. Second, and apart from Berry’s model, LaFromboise et al. (1993) alternation model is an adequate model among the rest of the models in explaining the process of interacting with two internalized but different cultures. Alternation model assumes that an individual can change his or her behavior to fit a particular cultural context and that this change may ultimately affect emotions as it will be explained later on. Furthermore, the multiculturalism transition processes introduced by LaFromboise et al. (1993) is explained vividly by the recent model introduced by Fitzsimmons (2013). Multiculturalism model assert that an individual can maintain a positive identity of the culture of origin and simultaneously develop a positive identity of the new culture as well (LaFromboise et al., 1993). In general, the acculturation literature provided a conceptual basis for what happens when an individual is adapting behaviorally and psychologically to the mainstream culture (second culture) or generally adapting to the dominant and non-dominant culture (Huynh, 2009).

The process of acculturation, or the formation of attitudes toward both cultures to decide how desirable each culture is, must occur prior to mentally organizing acquired cultural identities; thus, acculturation must be a precursor to bicultural and/or multicultural identity patterns (Brannen & Thomas, 2010).

In summary, the various models and strategies of acculturation presented above help to understand how biculturalism is a distinct strategy and why such a strategy is likely to be formed among individuals with two different cultures.

2.2.3 Biculturalism: Antecedents, Outcomes, & Moderation effects

Different factors play a role in determining the occurrence and the quality of integrating two distinct cultures. For instance, Hong (2010) asserted that having an effective cultural frame
switching and higher level of cultural metacognition can lead to higher bicultural competence and greater effectiveness of multicultural teams. Metacognition refers to the ability to regulate knowledge, processes, cognitive, and affective states in cross-cultural interactions (Thomas, Elron, Stahl, Ekelund, Ravlin, Cerdin, & Lazarova, 2008). Hong (2010) also asserted that cross-cultural abilities such as cross-cultural communication skills and behavioral adaptability can lead to better cultural frame switching and hence to high levels of bicultural competence. Understanding these antecedents of bicultural competence can help in understanding the possible antecedents of biculturalism. On the other hand, LaFromboise et al. (1993) found that having knowledge of cultural values and beliefs, bicultural efficacy, communication ability, having established networks with both groups, and positive attitudes toward original as well as dominant cultures helped in integrating and identifying with both cultures.

Regarding the outcomes associated with biculturalism, there are some studies that found that biculturalism is related to positive outcomes (e.g. Leung, Maddux, Galinsky, & Chiu, 2008; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980). First, at the organizational level, Brannen, Garcia, & Thomas (2009) suggested that the ability of the bicultural managers to bridge cultural barriers is highly linked to strategic performance and organizational effectiveness. In addition, multinational corporations’ (MNCs) profitability was also found to be related to the ability to develop leaders with multi-cultural skills to deal effectively with diverse stakeholders with different cultural background (Stroh & Caligiuri, 1998). Furthermore, Friedman and Liu (2009) found that biculturalism can help management in various managerial activities such as teams, decision making, dispute resolution, and leadership through two different dimensions: adaptability and boundary spanning. The first indicates the ability to shift actions according to
particular culture demands, whereas the second indicates the ability to serve as connector between the two cultures.

Second, at the individual level, scholars found that belonging to different cultures (i.e., multiculturalism) is positively related to higher level of creative performance and cognitive processes (Leung et al., 2008; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009). This relationship can be attributed to the ability of the bicultural individuals to encode information in different ways, and reconcile any inconsistencies between the different cultural perspectives (Saad, Damian, Benet-Martinez, Moon, and Robin, 2012). Furthermore, Lee (2010) found that individuals who have high cultural identifications (conceptually similar to biculturalism) with both home and host culture tend to be more effective with intercultural interactions.

Biculturals are also found to possess high integrative complexity that enables them to accept different perspectives concurrently which ultimately leads them to be more effective in responding and coping with cultural conflict (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006; Kramer, Lau-Gesk, & Chiu et al., 2009). Integrative complexity is defined as “the degree to which a person accepts the reasonableness of different cultural perspectives on how to live, both at the micro interpersonal level and at the more macro organizational-societal levels” (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006, p.2). Such capability enables the bicultural to develop a schema that can match the appropriate behavior to the expected cultural values. Furthermore, biculturals have an enhanced ability to develop an integrated cultural schema (Brannen & Thomas, 2010), which leads to higher cognitive complexity (Tadmor, Tetlock, & Peng, 2009) making them more flexible and capable of integrating ideas in creative ways (Leung et al., 2008). According to Benet-Martinez et al. (2006), cognitive complexity refers to “the degree of differentiation, articulation, and abstraction, within a cognitive system” (p. 388). Therefore, having a high level of integrative complexity
makes biculturals less susceptible to common biases (i.e. confirmation, anchoring, and selective perception biases) when making decisions (Friedman & Liu, 2009). Biculturals also tend to have high levels of bicultural efficacy which entails the ability to function effectively in both cultures besides having the ability and the skills to communicate (verbally and non-verbally) in both cultures (Hong et al., 2010; LaFromboise et al., 1993).

The positive outcomes associated with biculturals (at the individual levels or at the organizational levels) can be attributed to the deep knowledge of cultural values and beliefs (cultural schema) of both cultures as well as the differences that exist between them (Hong et al., 2010). The knowledge about culture and about cultural differences helps biculturals know the characteristics of the host country and to be more accepting of the host country nationals’ ways of thinking and acting (Nguyen, 2010).

Beside positive outcomes, other researchers found that biculturalism is also associated with negative outcomes such as social strains, identity confusion and value clashes and tensions (Haritatos & Benet-Martinez, 2002; Lee & Cochran, 1988; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). For instance, Vivero & Jenkins (1999) introduced the concept of cultural homelessness, where the individual is part of both cultures but feels rejected by both minority and majority groups. Such an experience can lead to code-switching difficulties, social and emotional confusion, shame, and self-blame. Haritatos & Benet-Martinez (2002) found also that biculturalism identity can be associated with contradiction, social strain, and tension.

It is important to note here that being bicultural does not necessarily guarantee experiencing some of the previous positive outcomes (Friedman & Liu, 2009). Some bicultural individuals develop knowledge about the two cultures but don’t identify with either one (Hong et al., 2007). That led some researchers to study the possible factors (moderators) that transfer an
individual from the state of knowing about the cultures to the state of internalizing the two cultures. For instance, the need for cognitive closure can moderate the relationship between exposure to various cultures and adaptation to these cultures (Kosic, Kruglanski, Pierro, & Mannetti, 2004). The need for cognitive closure is defined as “the individual desire to find an answer on a given topic in order to avoid the uncomfortable experience” (Kruglanski, 1990b, p.337). People with high need for cognitive closure are less adaptable to foreign cultures (Kosic et al., 2004) and less likely to accept new ideas from foreign cultures (Chiu, Morris, Hong, & Menon, 2000).

Hong (2010) found also that possessing bicultural competence moderated the relationship between cultural metacognition and multicultural team effectiveness. This means that biculturals are capable of managing complex cross-cultural interactions and ultimately can be more competent in international work settings. Beside differences mentioned above, bicultural competence also differs from biculturalism in that it emphasizes the ability to utilize the cultural knowledge and cross-cultural abilities to switch between the two cultures. Finally, Wei, Liao, Chao, Mallinckrodt, Tsai, & Botello-Zamarron (2010) indicated that being biculturally competent can moderate the relationship between minority stress and depressive symptoms. Minority stress refers to the stress experienced when identifying with a stigmatized group (Meyer, 2003). They found those with higher bicultural competence tend to have less depressive symptoms even though experiencing minority stress.

In summary, some factors influence the ability of the individuals to internalize two distinct cultures such as knowledge of cultural values and beliefs, bicultural efficacy, communication ability, and having established networks with both groups. Being bicultural can result in both positive and negative outcomes. Positive outcomes include high integrative
complexity, bicultural efficacy, and metacognition. Negative outcomes include social strains, identity confusion, value clashes, tensions and cultural homelessness. Most of the previous studies looked into the relationship between biculturalism and various skills (i.e. cross cultural communication) or cognitive capabilities (integrative complexity). Nobody has yet examined how biculturalism is associated with different emotions (i.e. conflicting or ambivalent emotions) and how these emotions eventually relate to attitudinal outcomes such as attitudes toward diversity.

2.2.4 Biculturalism: General Theories

Berry’s (1980, 1984, 1990, and 2003) framework of acculturation which introduced four different strategies of acculturation (assimilation, integration, separation and marginalization) was a milestone in explaining how individuals arrange their distinct cultural identities. The integration strategy of acculturation was used in particular to explore individuals who are immersed in more than one culture simultaneously (e.g., Berry, 2003; Padilla, 1994; Phinney, 1990). For instance, Berry and Kim (1988) found that immigrants who managed to integrate within the dominant culture were minimally stressed compared to those who were marginalized or assimilated to the dominant culture. The low stress level is attributed to maintaining the original culture and participating simultaneously within the larger social networks (Berry, 1990).

Various theories were used to rationalize either the process of being bicultural, the antecedents and the consequences of biculturalism. For example, Biculturalism theory (LaFromboise et al., 1993) was used to explain the various possible antecedents of being biculturally competent. LaFromboise and his colleagues suggested that many factors play a role in determining this level of competence such as knowledge of cultural values and beliefs, having positive attitudes toward both cultures, possessing the communication ability, behaving
congruently with both cultures, and having an established network with both cultures. For instance, David, Okazaki, and Saw (2009) found that these factors lead to higher bicultural competence, which eventually lead to higher psychological well-being (e.g., more life satisfaction and less depressive symptoms).

Another theory that is used repeatedly in the biculturalism literature is the cultural frame switching model (Hong et al., 2000), which explains how biculturals switch their cultural identities to enhance their abilities to adapt and communicate (Hong et al., 2010). Because biculturals possess two cultural identities, they are capable of cultural frame switching as a response to situational cues (Benet-Martines et al., 2002). For instance, Hong, Ip, Chiu, Morris, & Menon (2001) found that Chinese American biculturals exhibited Chinese behaviors that are congruent to the Chinese culture when primed with Chinese cues and American behaviors that are congruent to the American culture when primed with American cues.

To sum up, the previous frameworks explain how individuals possessing knowledge of two cultural systems organize these systems to form their identity taking into consideration the individual differences. It seems that cultural and situational cues affect how biculturals behave, but there is a need to further understand how emotions relate to both biculturalism and attitudes.

2.3 Emotional Ambivalence: Definition and Conceptualization

Numerous studies have looked into the role of expressed emotions on understanding social information and in guiding observer’s behaviors and judgments (Hareli & Rafaeli, 2008; Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006; and Rothman, 2011). However, few studies have investigated the practical implications of mixed emotions or emotional ambivalence (Williams & Aaker, 2002; Fong, 2006). Emotional ambivalence is defined as “simultaneous experience of two colliding emotions that are directed toward the same state of affairs where these conflicting
emotions are supposed to be fighting for predominance” (Kristjansson, 2010, p.292). A reason that can justify the lack of research in this area is the difficulty of recalling mixed emotions after some time (Aaker, Drolet, and Griffin, 2008). Before reviewing the constructs that are related to emotional ambivalence, it is important to note here that this study will use the term “mixed emotions” to refer to emotional ambivalence as they are conceptually similar (Williams & Aaker, 2002).

Reviewing the literature of emotional ambivalence showed that there are some constructs that are relevant but different from emotional ambivalence. For instance, Greenspan (1980), who started this line of research, emphasized the importance of differentiating between indecision about emotions and ambivalent emotions. Indecision simply refers to not clearly knowing the experienced emotions whereas emotional ambivalence is allegedly experiencing two conflicting emotions at once. Emotional ambivalence also differ from emotional vacillation as the later refers to frequent changes in one’s emotions, a case that is attributed to problems with the general character or the emotional makeup of the individual (Kristjansson, 2010). Another construct that is also different from emotional ambivalence is meta-emotion which is defined as “emotions that people have about their own emotions” (Jager & Bartsch, 2006, p.179). An example of a meta-emotion is feeling happy but feeling sad about feeling happy. Emotional ambivalence differs from meta-emotions as it occurs when emotions at the same level of emotional attentions are in conflict, whereas Meta-emotions occurs when experiencing concurrently a second-order emotion (e.g., joy) with a first-order emotion (e.g., anger). An example of an ambivalent emotion is feeling concurrently happy and sad on graduation day (Larsen, McGraw, and Cacioppo, 2001). This happens because two specific emotions about the same object (i.e., graduation day) are colliding such that the graduating student is so eager to
start his/her practical life but feels saddened because of departing his/her college life. Furthermore, another emotional state that differs from emotional ambivalence is having a negative emotional evaluation about a person’s action but at the same time having a positive emotion toward the person (Kristjansson, 2010). An example of such an emotional state occurs when there is love (positive emotion) directed toward a person but at the same time there is hate directed toward his/her negligent attention. Both emotions in the previous example were not directed toward the same object or the same state of affair and that’s why it is not emotional ambivalence. An example of emotional ambivalence can be represented by one emotion, such as happiness, which is directed towards a friend because he won the lottery and disappointment at him because he got it.

It is important also to note here that there is a difference between the expression of emotional ambivalence and the experience of emotional ambivalence (Rothman & Wiesenfeld, 2007), where the latter is investigated in this study. On the one hand, the expression of emotional ambivalence reflects tension, and individuals exhibiting emotional ambivalence are in self-debate between two different and distinct emotions (Kristjansson, 2010). On the other hand, Larsen et al. (2001) indicated that experiencing conflicting emotions simultaneously can be triggered by being in an “emotionally complex situation.” Dealing with distinct cultures simultaneously can represent a complex situation eliciting conflicting emotions. Thus, the expression of emotional ambivalence affects interpersonal relationships and social dynamics and it represents an emotional response to the experience of emotional ambivalence (Rothman & Wiesenfield, 2007).

Finally, King and Emmons (1990) introduced the construct ambivalence over emotional expression which means that individuals may be at conflict over being expressive versus
inexpressive of their emotions. Ambivalence over emotional expression may impede expression of emotions and these emotions normally must be “let out” as the healthier end of emotional response is emotional expression (King and Emmons, 1990).

Previous research indicated that there are two types of ambivalence: subjective and objective (Priester & Petty, 1996). Objective emotional ambivalence, which will be the focus of this dissertation, indicates the co-occurrence of negative and positive feelings individuals hold toward objects. Alternatively, objective emotional ambivalence also represents the level of conflicting reactions and hence increasing tensions and these are the components that ultimately lead to subjective ambivalence. Subjective emotional ambivalence refers to the increasing conflict and tension resulting from the objective ambivalence or a psychological state of conflict related to an object (Priester & Petty, 1996). In general, there is consensus in the literature that emotional ambivalence can cause extra burdens on those who experience it but this extra burden can also be a source of inspiration and strength (Kristjansson, 2010) or creativity because of the increase alertness and sensitivity leading to more positive outcomes (Fong, 2006).

Recent research on the area of emotional ambivalence showed that emotional ambivalence occurs in various organizational settings (Fong & Tiedens, 2002; Kristjansson, 2010; Pratt & Rosa, 2003), especially in difficult situations with trade-offs involved. Russell and Carolls (1999) and Larsen, McGraw, & Cacioppo (2001) also suggested that opposing emotions such as happiness and sadness can co-occur in tense (complex) situations such as graduation and move-out day or being the only promoted person among the team. These situations that can elicit ambivalence are considered to be unusual situations; however, empirical evidence showed that experiencing pure happiness or pure sadness is rare (Fong, 2006) and people tend to experience mixed emotions (Scherer & Tannenbaum, 1986). Furthermore, some researchers believe that
this phenomenon is more common than initially thought, and therefore, it is important to uncover situations where conflicting emotions are likely to occur (Fong & Tiedens, 2002; Fong 2006). Larsen et al. (2001) found that 60% of more than 200 respondents identified situations or conditions under which conflicting emotions emerged (i.e., sadness and happiness). In addition, neural processes associated with positive and negative affect support the assertion that opposing emotions can co-occur (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994).

In summary, emotional ambivalence is an emotional state where two conflicting emotions about the same affairs are fighting for predominance (Kristjansson, 2010). According to affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), work events, specific causes, and social environment can lead to elicitation of emotional reactions, and these reactions can influence work attitude or behaviors. Emotional reactions such as experiencing emotional ambivalence can occur in difficult situations with trade-offs involved (Fong & Tiedens, 2002). As biculturals have two distinct cultural knowledge systems and as their cultural values and schemas make up the social information surrounding them, their perceptions and emotions about work and ultimately their attitudes and behaviors can be influenced by their complex cultural composition. Thus, biculturals’ identification with distinct cultures can influence their emotions in general (Perunovic, Heller & Rafaeli, 2007), and ambivalent emotions in particular (Hong et al., 2007). The complexity associated with cultural composition (i.e., dealing and interacting with two or more different cultures) can be attributed to the rapid cultural frame switching in response to different cultural cues (Hong et al., 2000). Because the majority of biculturals are immersed in both cultures on a daily basis, there is a high frequency of frame switching and that can be exhausting and may have an emotional impact.
2.3.1 Emotional Ambivalence: Antecedents, Outcomes, & Moderation effects

Scholars have investigated several antecedents that affect the level of emotional ambivalence experienced. Kristjansson (2010) indicated that experiencing emotional ambivalence depends on the readiness of the cultural background to accommodate duality (accepting contradicting elements). For example, cultures characterized with high level of Confucianism and Buddhism tend to accept emotional duality more than Western cultures (Williams & Aaker, 2002). Confucianism and Buddhism philosophies are characterized by flexibility and constant change which differ from the philosophy of Enlightenment and Christianity (Peng & Nisbett, 1999).

Gender and culture also relates to emotional ambivalence. Bagozzi, Wong, & Youjae (1999) found that culture and gender play a role in determining the correlation between positive and negative emotions. Positive and negative emotions were positively correlated (in harmony with each other) for Chinese and Korean individuals, whereas they were inversely correlated (opposing each other) for their American counterparts. The above correlations were much stronger for both American and Chinese women. American and Chinese women exhibited higher positive correlation between positive and negative emotions than American men and Chinese men respectively. These findings emphasize the role of culture toward the propensity of experiencing emotional ambivalence. Position and status were also found to affect the incidence of experiencing emotional ambivalence. Fong & Tieden (2002) found that women with high status are more likely to experience emotional ambivalence than women with lower status. Negative and positive affect experienced were more similar and intense for women with high status than those with lower status. Furthermore, they found that conflicting emotions such as
happiness and sadness were significantly negatively correlated for women with low status positions and not related with women with high status.

Beside status, Kramer et al. (2009) also found that biculturals with higher level of duality expertise defined as the “level of expertise with managing simultaneous activation of the two selves” (p.662) respond more favorably to ambivalent messages. In their study they focused on the different ways biculturals respond to ambivalent messages rather than evaluating the level of experiencing emotional ambivalence.

In addition to readiness, culture, status, gender, and position, age is also a contributing factor to the experiences as well as the endurance of ambivalent emotions. For example, it was found that age plays a role in determining the level of coping with emotional ambivalence. Williams and Aaker (2002) indicated that older adults are better than younger adults to cope with contradicting emotions and hence synthesizing them.

In a related study, Molinsky (2007; 2013) introduced the concepts of “cross-cultural code switching” and “cultural retooling.” As individuals try to function in a new culture, they experience identity conflict which in turn may lead to distress and anxiety (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). To offset distress and anxiety, individuals tend to switch between the cultural codes they know to ensure appropriate behaviors (Molinsky, 2007). Cultural retooling indicates that individuals in a new culture may either adopt the instrumental approach or the integrative approach to achieve task performance. The former approach forces individuals to perform behaviors that are conflicting with them just to achieve the task, whereas the latter approach lead to finding means of accomplishing the task without performing any self-conflicting behaviors (Molinsky, 2013). According to Molinsky (2013), there are three stages of cultural retooling: deep conflict phase (feeling awkward when preforming new behaviors, ambivalent phase
(feeling less awkward about new behaviors), and authenticity phase (feeling ok with the new behaviors).

Beside the antecedents of experiencing emotional ambivalence, other studies have looked into various outcomes of emotional ambivalence. For example, Fong (2006) found that experiencing emotional ambivalence in organizations can lead to higher levels of creativity. Pratt (2000) found also that the expression of emotional ambivalence is related to identification with the organization, and commitment (Pratt, 2000). He found that more emotional ambivalent employees defined themselves more along the terms of the organization compared to others who are less ambivalent. Rees, Rothman, Lehavy, Sanchez-Burk (2013) found also that people who are experiencing emotional ambivalence tend to have better estimation accuracy (i.e., estimating outside temperature) because of their increasing receptivity of different alternative perspectives driven by their experiences of emotional ambivalence. Forming judgment based on various perspectives can help increase accuracy because various perspectives are associated with more information (Larrick & Soll, 2006).

In addition, Williams & Aaker (2002) found also that experiencing conflicting emotions can lead to unfavorable attitudes toward mixed emotions especially among those unwilling to cope with duality (e.g., Caucasians) as opposed to those with higher propensity to accept duality (e.g., Asian American, Mexican American). Duality represents the ability to synthesize contradicting elements like emotions (Basseches, 1980). The negative relationship between experiencing conflicting emotions and attitudes toward mixed emotions is attributed to the increased level of discomfort resulting from experiencing mixed emotions.

Based on my review, factors such as readiness, culture, status, gender, position, and age influence the experience of emotional ambivalence whereas as creativity, organizational
commitment, and attitudes toward mixed emotions are influenced by the experience of emotional ambivalence. In addition, based on my knowledge there was no study that utilized emotional ambivalence as a mediator in the relationship between biculturalism and any work attitudes. A better understanding of how identification with two distinct cultural knowledge systems for bicultural individuals affects their emotional make up and hence their attitudinal outcomes (i.e. attitudes toward diversity) can help explain the processes that leads to the attitudinal outcome and perhaps lists recommendations to modify any undesirable outcomes.

2.3.2 Emotional Ambivalence: General Theories

Before introducing the theories that have justified the occurrence of emotional ambivalence, it is important to address the various frameworks that looked into the organization of opposing emotions. In the emotion’s literature, there is a debate over whether bipolarity exists among opposing emotions or whether they can exist simultaneously (e.g. Feldman, Barrett, & Russell, 1998; Larsen et al., 2001). Russell (1980), and Russell and Carroll’s (1999) circumplex model asserts that individuals cannot experience feelings of sadness and happiness at the same time since these emotions are exclusive. The model called these emotions “polar opposites”. A relatively similar model to Russell (1980) and Russell & Caroll’s (1999) circumplex model is Watson and Tellegen’s (1985) model that suggests that opposing emotions are described by orthogonal dimensions. Watson and Tellegen’s (1985) model differs from the former model as it assumes that decrease in happiness cause an increase in sadness. On the other hand, the evaluative space model (Cacioppo & Bernston, 1994) suggests that positive and negative affect are different but still can coexist concurrently. Diener and Iran-Nejad’s (1986) findings support the evaluative space model as they found that positive and negative emotions can co-exist at a moderate level.
In addition to the previous models, some researchers have utilized the similarity-intensity model by Thompson, Zanna, & Griffin (1995) to gain a better understanding about the pre-requisite conditions for the occurrence of emotional ambivalence (e.g. Fong & Tiedens, 2002). In their model, Thompson et al. (1995) indicated that there are two conditions that can lead to ambivalence. First, a high similarity between positive and negative views toward a particular issue can result in increased ambivalence which simply means that the individual is experiencing both conflicting emotions. Second, high emotional intensity triggered by conflicting reactions toward the same issue can also increase ambivalence. Based on this model, emotional ambivalence exists when two opposing emotions (i.e. happiness and sadness) are experienced at a similar high level of intensity. Fong & Tiedens (2002) indicated that the affective structure is influenced by status where they found that high status women exhibited more emotional ambivalence than low status women.

Williams and Aaker (2002) utilized cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) to justify the relationship between emotional ambivalence (or mixed emotions) and feeling of discomfort as well as developing unfavorable attitudes toward mixed emotions. They asserted that as the inconsistency between two thoughts can result in an internal conflict which creates uncomfortable tensions or discomfort, affective inconsistency can result in tensions and discomfort as well. The contradicting emotions can be bothersome (like cognitive dissonance) eliciting a desire for consistency (Fong & Tiedens, 2001). Such a desire develops unfavorable attitudes toward mixed emotions.

Other scholars have drawn from informational theories of emotions (Forgas, 2000) to explain the positive outcomes of experiencing emotional ambivalence (e.g. Fong, 2006). These theories suggest that individuals experiencing conflicting emotions will consider such situations
as unusual and that in turn will increase alertness and sensitivity leading to more creative outcomes. In general people use emotions to alert them of the kind of environment they are operating in. For instance, when individuals sense that they are in unusual environment they tend to respond by utilizing their creative thinking (Fong, 2006).

In summary, the previously mentioned theories emphasized the similarity and the intensity level of experienced emotions (i.e. similarity-intensity model), the level of alertness associated with experiencing emotional ambivalence (informational theories of emotions) or the cognitive aspect of experiencing inconsistent emotions (cognitive dissonance theory). I, however, think that there is a need to examine how the social environment such as cultural backgrounds and the competence level of integrating the two distinct cultures (i.e. BII) relates to emotional ambivalence. Because none of the previous theories take into consideration the integration of identity and the level of cultural integration, I draw from social identity theory, affective events theory, and frame switching to present another perspective of how attitudes toward diversity are formed.

2.4 Bicultural Identity Integration (BII): Definition and Conceptualization

Despite the fact that many researchers found that biculturalism (integration in Berry’s model) is the most commonly used acculturation strategy, there is still variation in the level of integration among those bicultural individuals (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). Benet-Martinez et al., (2002) and Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, (2005) introduced bicultural identity integration (BII) as a new conceptual framework to clearly understand the psychological processes of how bicultural individuals organize their cultural identities cognitively and affectively. For instance, Benet-Martinez et al. (2002) indicated that low BII biculturals show contrast effects (i.e., behaving more American when exposed to Chinese primes and more
Chinese when exposed to American primes) between the two cultures as they experience the two cultures as contradictory and distinct, which “lead to a cognitive-affective linkage of the two cultural meaning systems” (p.510). These cognitive-affective processes lead to contrast effects since biculturals with low BII perceive their cultures to be very distinctive and hence display hypervigilance toward cultural cues. BII is defined as “the perceived compatibility versus opposition between two cultural orientations.” (Benet-Martinez et al, 2002, p.492). In a nutshell, BII is a construct that captures an individual’s perception of compatibility between two cultures (High BII) versus the perception of opposition between the two cultural orientations (low BII).

For instance, immigrants in a new country usually possess a strong sense of their ethnic culture and varying degrees of willingness to adapt to the new dominant culture associated with the new society (Phinney, 1997; Phinney et al, 2001). Those who easily integrate their original culture with the new culture because they perceive both cultures to be compatible are considered individuals with high BII, whereas those facing difficulty integrating the new culture because they perceive them to be opposing each other are considered to be low in BII. Individuals with high BII are similar to the hybridizing multiculturals in Fitzsimmons’ (2013) model as they identify with an intersection of both cultures whereas individuals with low BII are associated with compartmentalizing multiculturals as they retain both identities but separately.

Benet-Martinez & Haritatos (2005) asserted that BII is made of two different components: cultural blendedness and cultural harmony. These two components represent unique characteristics resulting from the dynamic and simultaneous utilization of the two cultures. First, cultural blendedness examines the level of overlap vs. disassociation between the two different cultural identities (perception of distance). Second, cultural harmony looks into the degree of harmony vs. clash perceived between the two identities (perception of conflict) (Benet-Martinez
& Haritatos, 2005; Miramontez, Benet-Martinez, & Nguyen, 2008). It is also important to note here that cultural blendedness is related to behavioral aspects of the individual whereas cultural harmony is related to affective aspects of the individual (e.g. Huynh, 2009; Huynh, Nguyen, & Benet-Martinez, 2011). Benet-Martinez and Hartiatos (2005) found that low cultural blendedness for Chinese American was related to performance challenges, whereas low level of cultural harmony was related to interpersonal strains due to the feeling of cultural isolation (Berry, 1990). This study will utilize the Harmony component of BII as it pertain to affective aspects which is one of the main focuses of this study.

After defining the different components of BII, it is important to shed light on the different constructs that are conceptually and theoretically related to BII. For instance, in their review of BII, Huynh et al. (2011) found that this construct is theoretically similar to identity conflict and to identity compartmentalization. Baumeister, Shapiro, and Tice (1985) introduced these two constructs and stated that identity conflict and identity compartmentalization may relate to BII-harmony and BII-blendedness respectively. Identity conflict refers to the incompatibility between two identities whereas identity compartmentalization refers to the isolation of identities into different domains (Huynh et al., 2010). With identity compartmentalization, the individual retain both identities but in separate spheres of his/her life and this can represents the level of blendedness between the two identities. With identity conflict the person has to make a choice between the two identities representing the less harmonious state between the two identities.

Another similar construct is bicultural competence introduced by LaFromboise et al. (1993). Based on their research of American vs. Chinese cultures, Benet-Martinez & Haritatos (2005, p.1025) defined high bicultural competence as “being strongly and equally involved with,
and comfortable in, both American and Chinese cultures in terms of both identification and behavioral skills.” Another construct that can be related to bicultural identity integration is social identity complexity introduced by Roccas and Brewer (2002). It refers to “an individual’s subjective representation of the interrelationships among his or her multiple group identities” (Roccas & Brewer, 2002, p.88). They suggested four different types of social identity based on how various identities are perceived by the in-group members: intersection, dominance, compartmentalization, and merger. Intersection refers to the simultaneous recognition of more than of one identity. The intersection of multiple identities (Roccas & Brewer, 2002) is conceptually more similar to BII than to the other three alternative identity structures. In addition to these two constructs, Kramer et al. (2009) introduced a similar construct to BII called duality expertise which refers to “level of expertise with managing simultaneous activation of the two selves” (p.662).

Ward (2008) also introduced a construct called “ethno-cultural identity conflict” that refers to perceived intrapersonal conflict between the dominant and the ethnic cultures. This construct is related to a lower level of BII- Harmony, which assesses the degree of perceived conflict between the two identities or cultural distance. For instance, it was found that among first generation immigrants in New Zealand, those from Korea exhibited higher level of cultural identity conflict than those from the United Kingdom due to the greater cultural distance between Korean vs. New Zealand cultures (Ward, 2008).

Finally, two constructs that are related to the two components of bicultural identity integration, BII-blendedness and BII-Harmony, are identity synthesis and identity confusion, respectively (Schwartz, 2006). Identity synthesis refers to “consistent and coherent self-understanding” whereas identity confusion refers to “lack of self-knowledge, and self-direction”
(Schwartz, 2006, p.778). So identity synthesis indicates that individuals can have a clear sense of identity and hence have a clear goal and clear guidance in selecting life choices (Cote & Levine, 2002) and in the case of biculturals this situation occurs when there is a huge overlap between the two identities (high blendedness). However, if the bicultural individual is undergoing identity confusion because of the fragmented sense of identity (Jones, Hartmann, Grochowski, & Glider, 1989) that represents a high clash level between the two internalized identities and hence low BII-harmony.

In summary, several constructs are related to bicultural identity integration as a whole or related to the different components of BII. This study will follow Benet-Martinez et al. (2002) definition of BII as the perceived compatibility rather than opposition between two cultural orientations. Based on this definition, BII can be examined through the frame switching model (Hong et al, 2000), which asserts that an individual can simultaneously have two interpretative frameworks associated with two cultural systems. Contingent to the person, these cultural systems can be compatible or conflicting.

2.4.1 Bicultural Identity Integration: Antecedents, Outcomes, & Moderation effects

Based on my review, there are many factors that determine the level of bicultural identity integration. For instance, Benet-Martinez & Haritatos (2005) asserted that variation in socio-cognitive factors (e.g., personality), sociocultural factors (e.g., cultural make-up of the society), and socio-emotional factors (e.g., in-group pressure) can have significant individual differences in the formation of BII. For example, they found that individuals who are rigid (low openness) are likely to compartmentalize their cultural identities, whereas neurotic individuals tend to perceive more conflict between their cultural identities.
Other researchers have examined the antecedents associated with each component of BII (Blendedness & Harmony). Haritatos & Benet-Martinez (2002) studied the relationship between personality factors, acculturation stressors and the BII-Blendedness and BII-Harmony. They found that factors such as neuroticism, personal experiences of discrimination, linguistic concerns (e.g., being concerned about one’s accent), and strained intercultural relations (e.g., being described by ethnic peers as too American) increase the level of cultural conflict resulting in low BII. Regarding the component of cultural distance (BII-Blendedness), it was found that factors such as low-openness to experience, low bicultural-competence, linguistic concerns, and feeling culturally isolated increased cultural distance, perception of having non-overlapping identities, resulting also in low BII. Huynh (2009) found also that emotional stability is positively related to BII-harmony.

In addition to personality factors, conditions of one’s ethnic group and its history play a role in determining the level of BII. Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) found that African Americans have higher BII compared to Mexican American. They attributed that to the longer and the more stable history of African Americans in the US. High objective cultural distance (cultural blendedness), based on Hofstede’s (1983) countries scores, also can lead to low BII-harmony (more cultural conflict) (Amiot, de la Sablonnière, Terry, & Smith, 2007; Ward, 2008). Due to these findings, Huynh et al (2011) suggested that BII-blendedness can be an antecedent of BII- Harmony. Higher objective cultural distance (based on Hofstede’s 1983 dimensions) can lead to low level of BII- blendedness and subsequently to higher conflict level (low BII-Harmony) between the two cultures (Huynh et al., 2011).

Beside antecedents of BII, other studies found positive outcomes associated with BII. For instance, it was found that Chinese American biculturals with high BII were able to have higher
number of non-Chinese friends and higher network density of non-Chinese friends compared to those with low BII (Mok, Morris, Benet-Martinez, & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2007). Bicultural individuals with high BII have also been found to have greater creativity in performance (Cheng et al., 2008).

As for those biculturals low in BII, it was found that they tend to have higher level of cognitive complexity as they are being more careful in processing cultural cues and have more complex sense-making (Tadmor et al., 2009; Benet-Martinez et al., 2006). This complex sense-making is driven by the increasing abilities of biculturals to detect and process everyday cultural meaning arising from the continuous cultural frame switching (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006). Thus, conflicting cultures identities (Low BII) may yield positive results because conflicting identities can lead to careful processing of various cultural cues leading to more complex cultural identification (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006; Brannen & Thomas, 2010) and more complex sense-making (Tadmor et al., 2009).

In terms of adjustment, research found that biculturals with high BII have better psychological adjustment (Downie, Koestner, ElGeledi, & Cree, 2004; Cheng et al, 2008). Psychological adjustment is defined as psychological and emotional well-being (Ward & Kennedy, 1994). According to Chen et al. (2008), better psychological adjustment is associated with greater life satisfaction, lower depression, less loneliness, lower anxiety, and greater happiness.

The study of BII is important in understanding biculturals’ behaviors (Benet Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). They found that BII affects the way biculturals react to different cultural cues. Specifically, Chinese-Americans high in BII responded with culturally expected behaviors when primed with external cues, whereas Chinese-Americans low in BII showed reverse culturally
expected behaviors (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002, Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) justified the non-congruent cultural behaviors associated with low BII biculturals as a result of their perceptions of their dual identities as oppositional and contradictory, which lead to independent affective and cognitive linkages with the two cultures meaning systems leading to culturally unexpected behaviors.

Besides the positive outcomes associated with BII, having a low BII level can yield some negative consequences. For example, it was found that biculturals with low BII are more likely to experience relational stress, discrimination stress, linguistic stress, and cultural isolation than those with high BII (Haritatos & Benet-Martinez, 2002; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). Furthermore, biculturals with low BII may experience higher level of internal conflict as they perceive the two cultures to be oppositional (Benet-Martinez, 2005). This perception of opposition causes biculturals with low BII to be sensitive to any tension between the two cultures and view this tension as cause of internal conflict (Miramontez et al, 2008), which may lead them to often feel that they should choose one culture over the other.

Other studies have looked into the outcomes associated with the two components of BII. For instance, it was found that a higher level of BII-blendedness was associated with a higher level of personality overlap rating among bicultural Cuban Americans and Latino Americans (Miramontez et al., 2008). Personality overlap in this study refers to the aligned personality self-view between the typical American and the typical Mexican. In addition, Huynh et al. (2011) found that BII-blendedness is weakly related to affective outcomes such as anxiety, hostility, and depression, because the compartmentalization between the two cultures is not linked to psychological adjustment. High BII-Harmony, on the other hand, is associated with lower rates
of anxiety and depression because BII-Harmony captures the feelings and the attitudes toward both cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2010).

Finally, some studies have looked into the moderation effect of BII on various organizational outcomes. For instance, in their first study of BII, Benet-Martinez et al. (2002) showed how BII moderates cultural priming effects on social attribution. Bicultural individuals with high BII primed with cultural cues responded consistently to cultural cues (e.g., behaving in a Chinese way after being primed with Chinese culture cues), whereas bicultural individuals with low BII responded inconsistently to the culture cues they were primed with (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002).

Mok & Morris (2009) found interaction effects between cultural cues and BII in determining the individual’s uniqueness-seeking level and extraversion among Asian Americans. They found that biculturals with high BII perceived themselves as more uniqueness-seeking and more extraverted when primed with American versus Asian cultures. Biculturals with low BII perceived themselves as less uniqueness-seeking and less extraverted when exposed to the same priming. Mok and Morris (2010) found also that BII moderated the relationship between cultural cues and creative performance. They found that Asian American with high BII produced more novel solutions when primed with American cultures than with Asian cultures, whereas individuals with low BII generated less novel solutions when primed with the American culture. Finally, Saad et al. (2012) found also a significant interaction effect between cultural context (i.e., monocultural or bicultural) and BII-blendedness in predicting idea generation (ideational fluency). They found that those in a bicultural context with high level of BII-blendedness generated more ideas than those who were in a monocultural context and low level of BII-blendedness.
In summary, most of the research conducted about BII focused on evaluating various predictors of BII (e.g., personality factors, and cultural factors) or outcomes of BII (e.g. cognitive and psychological outcomes). Yet, there were no studies that have examined how BII affects the process of forming emotions for biculturals. Because of this gap, understanding how the level of compatibility between the two internalized cultures for biculturals affects the likelihood of forming ambivalent emotions as well as positive attitudes toward diversity can provide a better understanding of the role of BII in explaining both emotional ambivalence and attitudes toward diversity.

2.4.2 Bicultural Identity Integration: General theories

Multiple theories have been used to explain the relationship between bicultural identity integration and other variables such as BII theory (e.g., Hyuan, 2009; Mok & Morris, 2009; Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2007), social identity theory (e.g., Cheng et al., 2008; Huang 2009), cultural frame switching (e.g., Cheng, Lee & Benet-Martinez, 2006; Friedman, Liu, Chi, Hong, & Sung, 2012), and the creative cognition approach (Cheng et al., 2008).

The BII theory breaks down BII into two different components: cultural blendedness and cultural harmony to understand how cultural identity is formed for biculturals (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). For instance, Mok and Morris (2009) used BII theory to explain why high BIIs shift in a culturally congruent direction to the cultural priming whereas low BIIs shift in the reverse direction. According to the BII framework, biculturals with high BII assimilate to salient and situational cultural cues (Ramirez-Esparza, Gosling, Benet-Martinez, Potter, & Pennebaker, 2006). On the other hand, biculturals with low BII exhibit more external attributions by defying cultural norms (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002).
Others have drawn from social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and creative-cognitive approach (Smith, Ward, & Finke, 1995) to explain the relationship between identity integration and creative performance (Cheng et al., 2008). Social identity theory postulates that individuals may have different social identities, allowing them to have access to various knowledge systems (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). When BII is high, biculturals have simultaneous access to both knowledge systems and thus can be more creative. Knowledge systems represent the behaviors, attributes, and information of particular social categories (Cheng et al., 2008). According to the creative-cognition approach (Smith et al., 1995), having access to different knowledge systems associated with different identities allow biculturals to recombine related as well as unrelated existing knowledge, which can enhance creative performance.

Cultural frame switching (Hong et al., 2000) was also utilized to explain how cultural cues (positive vs. negative) moderate the relationship between the level of BII (high vs. low) and whether it leads to responses that are culturally congruent or incongruent (Cheng et al., 2006). Frame switching refers to the shifts between two interpretive cultural frameworks in response to cues from the environment (LaFromboise et al., 1993). Cheng et al. (2006) found that biculturals with high BII respond in culturally congruent ways when exposed to positive cultural cues (e.g., status of liberty, Great Wall of China, and Mickey Mouse), whereas biculturals with low-BII showed culturally incongruent ways when exposed to the same cues. The response was the opposite when negative cultural cues (negative words to Asian and American people) were used where high BII biculturals exhibited contrast effects while low BII biculturals exhibited congruent or assimilated effects. According to the cultural frame switching framework, biculturals possess two cultural interpretive frameworks that guide their behaviors (Hong et al., 2000). They tend to shift between their cultural interpretive frameworks to respond to various
social cues (Hong, Benet-Martinez, Chiu, & Morris, 2003). Biculturals who are low in BII perceived the primes (cultural cues) as non-representative of the culture, and this oppositional perception caused difficulty in switching cultural interpretive frameworks and cultural incongruent interpretations for these biculturals. Biculturals high in BII perceive the two cultural interpretive frameworks to be more compatible than biculturals low in BII and hence have a smoother cultural frame switching leading to responses that are culturally congruent.

In summary, the theories used to examine BII looked mostly at the cognitive aspects of biculturals such as the identity integration and the switching between two distinct cultural frameworks. These theories emphasized mainly how biculturals integrate their two identities, the quality of the integration, and the cognitive and behavioral consequences associated with compatible vs. oppositional integration of identities. Therefore, I believe it is important to explore how the level of bicultural integration influences emotions.

Based on the literature review for this dissertation, I find several theoretical and empirical gaps about biculturalism and how it relates to attitudinal variables. Including emotional ambivalence as a mediator on the relationship between biculturalism and attitudes toward diversity opens a new venue on the biculturalism literature. In addition, understanding the role that BII plays in the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence is an important addition to both BII and biculturalism. This understanding can highlight how the cognitive process of identity formation affect the elicitation of emotions for those individuals with more than one identity (i.e., biculturals). Furthermore, most of the previous BII studies covered the same ethnic groups: Asian American or Chinese Americans (Huynh, 2009). In this study I examine BII in a different ethnic group: Mexican Americans.
Chapter 3: Theory Development and Hypotheses

The theoretical model of this study is depicted Figure 3.2. In this dissertation, I intend to explain the direct relationships between biculturalism and both emotional ambivalence as well as attitudes toward diversity. I hypothesize that this relationship is contingent upon the level of bicultural identity integration (BII). In turn, the level of emotional ambivalence also influences attitudinal outcomes, such as attitude toward diversity.

The integration of social identity theory (e.g., Turner, Brown and Tajfel 1979; Tajfel, 1981), the frame switching model (Hong et al., 2000), and affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) provides the theoretical framework to explain the relationships shown in Figure 3.2.

3.1 Social Identity Theory (Brown and Tajfel 1979; Tajfel, 1981)

People prefer to think of themselves and others as members of different groups instead of being independent individuals (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011). Social identity is defined as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his (or her) knowledge of his (or her) membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1974, p.69). The first tenet of social identity theory postulates that social identity is based mainly on group membership and individuals strive to maintain a positive social identity because that will affect their self-esteem, “the need for distinctiveness” (Tajfel, 1975). The second tenet of this theory states that positive self-identity is mainly derived from the favorable comparison with the relevant out-groups (Brown, 2000). However, Ellemers and Haslam (2011) indicated in their review of the theory that positive social identity can also result from individual mobility (i.e., escaping a devalued identity to a more valued one), social
creativity (i.e., emphasizing the positive characteristics of the group), and social competition (i.e., engaging in conflict to change the status of the group). For instance, individual mobility is represented by feelings of discontent or deprivation among members of subordinate groups, which may lead, to de-identification of the individual from the in-group, or to show more interest toward the out-groups, or finally to use different out-groups for comparison (Smith, Tyler, Huo, Ortiz & Lind, 1998).

The third tenet states that categorizing individuals into groups make people label themselves in terms of “us” and “them” and that induces individuals to treat in-group members differently from out-group members (Ellemers and Haslam, 2011). Group categorization (categorizing individuals into groups) is based on central group-defining characteristics, which differentiate them from members of the out groups (Tajfel, 1978a). In-group members tend to accentuate these similar characteristics to emphasize the bases of their membership, and they also tend to focus on the differences that distinguish them from the out-group members. Finally, in-group bias or group favoritism is more prevalent among members of high-status groups as compared to members of low-status groups (Turner, 1978).

Social identity is not solely based on cognitive awareness but also on emotional significance of the group to the self-construal (Tajfel, 1974, 1978a, 1978b). Self-construal refers to the knowledge about oneself and that includes social roles, personality attributes, past experience, and future goals (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). The level of emotional importance of identifying with a particular group can drive members to protect and uphold the values of the group (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011). Hence, social identity theory aims to explain how individuals choose to behave in accordance to their social identities instead of their individual identities (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011). Furthermore, social identity theory highlights the different strategies
members of low status social groups utilize in order to improve the value of their groups (Tajfel, 1978c).

In addition to the various tenets of the theory, there are some factors that are required to ensure proper group comparison. Tajfel & Turner (1986) identified three factors that may influence a group’s comparison: a) individuals must be able to identify themselves with the in-group, b) intergroup comparison dimensions or attributes should be important to in-group members and out-groups should have basis for comparison, and c) the situation should allow such comparison to take place.

3.2 Frame Switching Model (Hong et al., 2000)

Frame switching or the dynamic constructivist approach is a model that represents how bicultural individuals shift between different interpretive frames associated with different cultures (Hong et al., 2000). This shifting takes place as a response to the differences in environmental cues such as context and language (LaFromboise et al., 1993; Padilla, 1994). Despite the fact that bicultural individuals internalized two different cultures (LaFromboise et al., 1993), the two cultures are not necessarily blended together or one of them is replacing the other (Hong et al., 2000). Therefore, bicultural individuals rely on knowledge of either of the two internalized cultures to interpret the different daily situations and to decide on the appropriate attitudes or behaviors to take. Frame switching represents the shift between two mindsets ingrained in different cultures that takes place to reach a better fit between the situation and the appropriate behavior or attitude according to the cultural schemes associated with the setting (Hong et al., 2000; Mok, 2010).

The first tenet of this approach claims that culture is internalized in a loose formation of specific categories of knowledge networks rather than integrated structures (Burner, 1990). The
second tenet postulates that individuals can possess different cultural systems simultaneously even if these systems are conflicting (Hong et al., 2000). But that does not mean that these conflicting cultural systems will guide cognition simultaneously. For instance, Bell (1990) found in her study of working black women that they were exposed to distinct cultural contexts (i.e. being black and working in a dominant white society), and as a result they had to compartmentalize their lives based on their different cultural systems to manage the different dimensions of biculturals’ daily life. The compartmentalization is represented by the interpretation of any particular event based on connecting various pieces of cultural knowledge. The third premise of this model postulates that the relative accessibility to the cultural knowledge system determines how much it influences the interpretation of any situation (Higgins, 1996) or what cultural self-construal would be enacted (Hong et al., 2000). The accessibility of the cultural meaning system can be elevated by priming individuals with cultural icons (Hong et al., 2000). For instance, cultural icons (e.g. US flag, Chinese dragon, Marilyn Monroe) can stimulate frame switching (Ringberg, Reihlen, Luna, Peracchio, 2010). Morris and Peng (1994) and Hong et al. (2000) found that Chinese Americans, for instance, tend to evaluate events based on their Chinese culture when they perceive themselves as closer to the Chinese culture and based on their American culture when they perceive themselves as closer to the American culture.

Biculturals confront on a daily basis various triggers (i.e. religious icon, and cultural icons) that evoke a particular frame of mind (Betsky, 1997). Therefore, the icons surrounding biculturals during an event requiring forming a thought, feeling, or action play a role in determining which interpretive framework should be accessed. Many bicultural individuals indicated that they switch between the two internalized cultures (interpretive frameworks) to guide their feelings and thoughts (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). The switch can occur
easily and quickly as a response to pictures or images shown in a research lab (Friedman & Liu, 2009; Hong et al., 2000). In general, this model investigates the relationship between culture and behaviors, emotions, acculturation, and motivation (Hong et al., 2000). In summary, biculturals identify with more than one culture, have different interpretive frameworks associated with these cultures, and the activations of these frameworks is contingent to the situational factors.

### 3.3 Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996)

Affective events theory explores how some specific work events, such as supervisor’s behavior (Liden & Mitchell, 1985) can lead to emotional reactions and how these reactions can influence work attitudes or behaviors (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). When these events trigger positive or negative emotions, finding behaviors that cope with the triggered emotions becomes a priority for the individual experiencing the emotion (Lazarus, 1991; Bleschak and Hartog, 2009). The context where the events takes place plays a significant role in the process of eliciting emotions as it determines the intensity of the emotions. For instance, Bleschak and Hartog (2009) found that receiving negative feedback in public versus in private can elicit more intense negative emotional reactions.

The elicitation of different emotions takes place because work events contain cues that have some affective importance. In addition, social environments affect attitudes and judgments made about work. Cultural values and schemas make up the social information that influence how individuals, whether monocultural or bicultural, develop their perceptions and emotions about work and hence develop their attitudes and behaviors (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

Frijda (1993) described emotions as having an experiential component of affect, tied to an appraisal of an event, characterized by psychological bodily changes, and finally including readiness to deal with the environment. Ekman (1992) also concluded that in order for an
individual to experience an emotion, appraisal of some environmental events should take place. Scherer (2001) asserted also that emotions are continuously evolving mechanisms that are adaptable to environmental cues and contingencies. He claimed that emotions are results of evaluation or appraisal of the significance level of an event and how important this particular event is to survival. Many factors can influence the evaluation processes of an event such as moods, motivational states (Forgas, 1991) and cultural values (Mesquita, Frijda & Scherer, 1997).

The processes of how individuals evaluate certain events, whether at work or outside of work, and develop a particular emotion that represents their interpretations of the event can be a very complex process. The factors that contribute to this complexity include cognitive judgment, social influence, and dispositional or personality factors. Affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) considers all of these factors. The theory suggests that work events (that are influenced by both work-environmental features and dispositional factors) elicit affective reactions that ultimately affect work attitudes and behaviors. Affective reactions can have a direct effect on behaviors (affect driven behaviors) or indirect effects (judgment driven behavior) mediated by attitudes.

According to AET, events are happenings and occurrences that involve changes in circumstances (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). These changes in circumstances have an affective importance and play a role in the elicitation of a specific emotion. AET suggests that the process starts by evaluating the event in positive and negative terms (primary appraisal) such as assessing the relevance of the events to the common valued goals. This general evaluation or appraisal is followed by a more specific evaluation that focuses on the context and the attributions which eventually results in the experience of emotion. The specific appraisal or the “secondary
appraisal” is directed toward the analysis of the meaning of the events (Smith & Pope, 1992). Beside situational cues, dispositional or individual factors play also a role in the processes of emotion elicitation and hence affect various attitudes and behaviors. Yet, studying dispositional factors should not be separated from studying the environment and the situation itself (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

Several studies have explored how emotions can influence attitudes (e.g., Breckler & Wiggens, 1989; & Edward, 1990) or behaviors (e.g., Miller & Tesser, 1986). Attitudes can be constructed in ways which are in accordance with the traditional view that suggests that when individuals are asked to indicate their attitudes about objects, coworkers, and supervisors, they tend to rely on their stored evaluation (Wilson & Hodges, 1992). These stored evaluations can also include affective experiences (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

3.4 Hypothesis Development

In the first hypothesis of the model, I hypothesize that bicultural individuals are more likely to experience emotional ambivalence, defined as “simultaneous experience of two colliding emotions that are directed toward the same state of affairs where these conflicting emotions are supposed to be fighting for predominance” (Kristjansson, 2010, p.292). Everybody experiences emotional ambivalence to some extent (Scherer & Tannenbaum, 1986). For example, a graduating student may feel happy because he managed to finish his/her degree but sad at the same time because he/she will miss a lot of friends who he/she have been with for the last couple of years. However, experiencing emotional ambivalence can be a major part of everyday life for biculturals (Hong et al., 2007).

I argue that bicultural individuals will experience high level of emotional ambivalence. The rationale for this argument is mainly based on the frame switching model. According to this
model, bicultural individuals can possess different cultural systems simultaneously, and these systems can be conflicting (Hong et al., 2000). These different cultural systems represent two different sets of interpretive frameworks, and relying on them simultaneously can be confusing and stressful (Bell, 1990). Biculturals’ multiple identification with distinct cultures can influence their emotions in general (Perunovic et al., 2007), and ambivalent emotions in particular (Hong et al., 2007). The elicitation of ambivalent emotions can be justified due to the fact that biculturals face numerous situations associated with cultural cues from both cultures that compete together for influence (Perunovic et al., 2007; Hong et al., 2000). The presence of these cultural cues can be concurrent especially in a bicultural setting (Hong et al., 2000). Biculturals will try not to violate either cultural schema and hence one can expect that such situations may elicit mixed or ambivalent emotions.

Ambivalent emotions can result when a bicultural individual is satisfied about the event as per the first culture schema and simultaneously dissatisfied as per the other culture schema. For instance, dealing with a particular situation confronting a bicultural might be rewarding according to the mainstream culture and punishable as per the subordinate culture. For example, a Mexican American employee working in an American corporation may be motivated to speak up in a meeting where he/she is the lowest ranking staff among others. Such behavior is acceptable in the American culture since there is a low level of power distance (Hofstede, 1980); however, being also a member of a Mexican culture entails that this employee be respectful to other senior staff and he/she should accept the power inequality. The person may feel joy because he managed to contribute his/her inputs in the meeting but yet he/she may feel shame due to the fact that he/she has challenged his conventional values related to his/her Mexican
culture. In summary, this bicultural person experiences ambivalent emotions simultaneously: joy and shame.

The rationale for this hypothesis is congruent also with social identity theory (Tajfel, 1974, 1978a, 1978b) that indicates that social identification is not solely based on cognitive awareness but also on emotional significance of the group to the self-construal. However, identifying with two distinct cultures and concurrently having emotional attachments to both of them knowing that the interpretive framework associated with each culture may be conflicting with the other can cause ambivalence because the identification with two distinct groups is attached with different emotions.

A part from the social identity, culture was also found to play a role in determining the relationship between positive and negative emotions Bagozzi et al. (1999). They found that positive and negative emotions were positively correlated (in harmony with each other) for Chinese and Korean whereas they were inversely correlated (opposing each other) for Americans. Bagozzi et al. (1999) justified these findings because people from independent cultures (i.e., U.S.) deeply analyze emotions, and these emotions are represented linguistically in oppositional state. However, people from interdependent cultures (i.e., Chinese & Korean) don’t devote much time to analyze emotions and hence emotions are seen as secondary reactions. Priority is given to developing fit with others, expressing commitment to the group and avoiding conflict. These findings depict the effect of culture toward experiencing emotional ambivalence.

There is no research that examines that relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. Empirically, there are two studies that addressed the relationship between biculturalism and emotional reactivity or adaptability, defined as “being able to better manage emotions” (Chao, Chen, Roisman, & Hong, 2007; Friedman and Liu, 2009). Chao et al. (2007)
found that Chinese American showed greater emotional reactivity when talking about their cultural experiences. Friedman and Liu (2009) found that biculturals possess better emotional skills as they are more familiar with various ways of eliciting, experiencing, and controlling emotions. In addition to these two studies, Kramer et al. (2009) found that the level of duality expertise (which is conceptually similar to BII) moderates the relationship between biculturalism and responding to ambivalent messages.

Therefore, based on the theory and empirical evidence, I hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 1**: Biculturalism is positively related to emotional ambivalence.

Next, I hypothesize that the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence will be moderated by the level of (BII). Bicultural individuals vary in their perception of how oppositional or compatible the two internalized cultures they belong to are (Fitzsimmons, 2013; Padilla, 1994; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). According to Benet-Martinez & Haritatos (2005) BII captures the level of compatibility between the two cultures (High BII) or the oppositional level and the difficulty to integrate (Low BII). Biculturals with high levels of BII have no conflict between the two internalized cultures and they are capable of smoothly engaging in cultural frame switching between the two cultures. Biculturals with low BII have conflict integrating the two cultural frameworks (Haritatos & Benet-Martinez, 2002; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). The inability to build a coherent sense of identity between the two cultures can be a source of internal conflict (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005) and discomfort (Dickens & Dickens, 1982). In addition, because of the increased stress accompanying their bicultural status, bicultural individuals with low BII are expected to internalize negative labels or characteristics with both mainstream and ethnic cultures (Hogg & Turner, 1987), which in turn leads to higher feeling of internal conflict (Benet-Martinez et al.,
I, therefore, propose that the positive relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence is stronger for individuals low in BII because these individuals will be more likely to experience oppositional and/or conflicting views about the two cultural frameworks as opposed to individuals with high BII. In addition, Individuals with low BII will not be able to smoothly switch from one culture to the other. Therefore, biculturals low in BII will be more exposed to feeling conflicting emotions in relation to the two cultural frameworks.

Consistent with affective events theory, that indicate that environmental factors including social information (e.g., cultural values and schemas) influence how individuals elicit their emotions, I argue that the level of integration of two cultural schemas will moderate the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence.

Therefore, I hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 2:** The relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence will be moderated by the biculturals’ level of (BII). The positive relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence will be stronger with low level of BII than with high levels of BII.

In the next hypothesis, I hypothesize that biculturals that are high in BII will experience lower levels of emotional ambivalence as they experience lesser level of conflict due to their dual cultural identities. These biculturals view both cultures as complimentary. On the other hand, biculturals that are low in BII will experience higher level of emotional ambivalence as they perceive both cultures to be oppositional and hence higher level of conflict may arise between the two cultures leading to more emotional ambivalence.

**Hypothesis 3:** BII is negatively related to emotional ambivalence.
Next, I state that a bicultural individual will have higher level of positive attitudes toward diversity. Bicultural individuals can originally be immigrants, international students, ethnic minorities, or sojourners (Berry, 2003), who usually strive to adapt to the mainstream culture in order to be accepted in the new culture. Part of that striving includes suppression of one’s own differences and attempts to accept diverse others in the mainstream cultures to be able to merge smoothly into the mainstream culture.

Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1969; Tajfel et al., 1971) states that individuals categorize themselves into groups, labeling themselves as opposed to others in terms of “us” and “them,” which in turn induces them to treat in-group members differently from out-group members. The in-group categorization is based on positive characteristics that distinguish the in-group from the out-group (Tajfel, 1978a, 1978b, 1978c; Tajfel and Turner, 1986). Bicultural individuals identify with different cultures as they belong to two distinct groups. As biculturals see themselves belonging to different cultures, their perspective of what constitutes the in-group will be wider and more encompassing than those for monoculturals. Therefore, generally speaking I expect that biculturals will have more positive attitudes toward diversity because they will have a more tolerant view of who can be part of their in-group.

Empirically, Strauss and Connerley, (2003) found that higher levels of exposure to diversity lead to higher positive levels of attitude toward diversity (ATD). In general, a bicultural individual usually have a higher level of exposure to diversity and hence a tolerant attitude toward others which can be attributed to the facto of belonging to two distinct cultures compared to the one culture that others (i.e., monoculturals) identify with.

Thus, I hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 4:** Biculturalism is positively related to attitudes toward diversity (ATD).
In the final hypothesis, I expect that emotional ambivalence will mediates the joint effect of biculturalism and bicultural identity integration on attitudes toward diversity. Affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) stipulated that emotions mediate the relationship between both work events that are influenced by work environmental factors (e.g., dealing with diverse others) as well as disposition factors (e.g., being bicultural) and work attitude (e.g., attitude toward diversity). I suggest that biculturalism relates to emotional ambivalence because bicultural individuals can possess different cultural systems simultaneously, and these systems can be conflicting (Hong et al., 2000). Relying on these conflicting cultural systems simultaneously can be confusing and stressful (Bell, 1990). As biculturals face numerous situations associated with cultural cues from both cultures that compete together for influence (Perunovic et al., 2007; Hong et al., 2000), biculturals will try not to violate either cultural schema and hence one can expect that such situations may elicit mixed or ambivalent emotions.

In turn emotional ambivalence relates to attitudes in general and attitudes toward diversity in particular because individuals experiencing emotional ambivalence tend to be more alert and sensitive to different environmental cues triggered by the different cultures they belong to (Fong, 2006; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

Thus, I hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 5:** Emotional ambivalence mediates the joint effect of biculturalism and BII on attitudes towards diversity.
Chapter 4: Method

4.1 Sample and Procedure

As there were two samples involved, I will call the first study involving Business schools’ students and their significant others Study 1. The second sample involving international students’ will be called Study 2. An alpha level of 0.05 was used for the statistical tests in these studies.

4.1.1 Participants

Participants were two groups of college level students located in the Southwest of the USA. The first group constituted 213 undergraduate students (98 male and 115 female, mean age = 25.25, SD=7.1) from the College of Business Administration in the spring 2014 semester. This group of students was enrolled into various business courses and they were offered extra credit in return for answering two different online surveys at two different times during the semester. Students who were not interested in participating in the study were given an alternative assignment. The reason behind selecting student samples from this university was that the population of students is mostly bicultural and most of them are working students. Of this sample, 39 students identified themselves as monoculturals and therefore were eliminated from the sample, ending with a final sample of 174 students (78 male and 96 female, mean age = 27.6, SD=6.9).

Only one student opted to do the alternative assignment. One significant other for each participating student (e.g., husband, wife, friend, roommate, classmate, and workmate) was also invited to participate in a one-time online survey to answer questions related to the respondents’ attitudes toward diversity, biculturalism and various control variables. Participating significant others were offered a $10 gift card as an incentive to participate.
The second group consisted of 215 international students (120 male, 95 females, mean age = 23.8, SD= 5.6) at the time of the study. These participants were undergraduate and graduate students recruited through the office of international programs. Participants were offered a gift card worth $5 dollars to a local coffee shop in return for answering the survey. This group was selected because of the likelihood of them being self-identified as biculturals given that they were originally from different countries who came to the U.S. for educational purposes. Another reason for using this group was to replicate the findings of study 1. A total of 77 of the participants self-identified as monoculturals and were removed from the sample. The remaining 138 (85 male and 53 female, mean age = 23.8, SD= 5.9) self-identified as biculturals. All the bicultural students indicated that they lived at least 1 year in the United States (M= 10.23, SD= 8.321).

4.1.2 Procedures

Before answering the surveys, participants in both studies were instructed to read an IRB approved consent form and were asked to write their names as an indication of their agreement to participate in the study. Participants in Study 1 were given two online surveys at two different points in time, whereas the significant other group was asked to complete only one online survey. Study’s 1 participants were informed that they were expected to participate in an online survey about cultural values and performance at two different points in time. During Phase 1, I measured biculturalism (IV), BII (moderator), and emotional ambivalence (mediator). During Phase 2, students were given similar information about the study and they were asked to answer questions about attitudes toward diversity (DV) as well as emotional ambivalence. The control variables were collected in both phases. Students were alerted of the dates of taking the surveys
and they were instructed how to access the online survey. The duration of answering each survey was between 15 to 25 minutes.

Study’s 2 participants were all holders of F1 or J1 visas (Students’ visas). They were contacted through the office of international students. This group also answered one on-line survey. The duration of taking the survey ranged from 20 to 30 minutes. This survey combined questions from both Time 1 and Time 2 answered by study’s 1 participants.

4.2 Studies 1 & 2 Measures

Biculturalism. The independent variable was measured using three newly developed items. The three items for this measure were: “Have you lived in another country for more than 3 months?,” “In which languages do you fluently speak?,” and “In which language do you fluently write?” As a formative measure (Edward and Bagozzi, 2000), it is not expected that the individual items are highly correlated with each other (Bollen & Lennox, 1991). However, the three items were highly correlated with each other as indicated in Table 1.

Bicultural Identity Integration. I measured bicultural identity integration using five items drawing from two existing measures: BIIS-1 (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005) and BII-2 (Huynh, 2009). These five items are part of the scale that measure the BII-Harmony component. The five items were: “I feel caught between the (cultural 1) and (cultural 2),” “I feel like someone moving between two cultures,” “Being a bicultural means having two cultural forces pulling on me at the same time,” “I feel conflicted between the (culture 1) and the (culture 2) of doing things,” and “I feel torn between (culture 1) and (culture 2). All the five items were reversed scored. Response options were at 7-point scales (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). I averaged the responses of the five items to create a scale for BII, with higher scores
indicating higher identity integration, $M = 4.25$, $SD = 1.36$, range = 5.80). The internal reliability for the scale was $\alpha = 0.84$ (Study 1).

*Emotional Ambivalence.* According to Back, Schmukle, and Egloff (2009) emotional ambivalence can be measured either through subjective or objective measures. Emotional ambivalence was measured using two different measures to make sure the experience of emotional ambivalence was captured. The first measure that examined the state of emotional ambivalence was adopted from the measures established by Rothman (2011) and Larsen et al (2001). Participants of the study were asked to assess the following emotions at the time of taking the survey: torn, ambivalent, and conflicted. Ambivalent emotion was measured as a sum of torn, conflicted, and ambivalent (Rothman, 2011). Response options were on 7-point scales (1 = not at all and 7 = very much). The internal reliability for the scale was $\alpha = 0.90$ (Study 1).

Second, participants were asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the experience of emotional ambivalence with three items created for the purpose of this study. The three items were as follows: “How often do you experience emotional ambivalence,” “I experienced mixed feelings,” and “I experienced conflicting emotions simultaneously.” Response options were in a Likert-type scale from (never = 0 times) to (often = 6 to 9 times). This is a subjective measure of felt ambivalence as participants were asked directly how emotionally ambivalent they were during the time of taking the survey. I averaged the responses to the three items to create a scale for emotional ambivalence. Participants were asked to answer the three items both at Time 1 and Time 2 to establish test-retest reliability. The internal reliability for the scale was $\alpha = 0.92$, and $\alpha = 0.94$ for Time 1 and Time 2 respectively.

Furthermore, I conducted a one-factor CFA for the three items of emotional ambivalence. Results indicated that the measure of emotional ambivalence has a good fit for both Study 1 at
Time 1 \( \chi^2 = 1.928, \text{df}=1, \chi^2 / \text{df} = 1.920, \text{CFI}=0.997, \text{SRMR}= .01, \text{RMSEA}= .078 \) and Study 2 \( \chi^2 = 2.028, \text{df}=1, \chi^2 / \text{df} = 2.028, \text{CFI}=0.997, \text{SRMR}= .01, \text{RMSEA}= .082 \). The measure of emotional ambivalence also has good discriminant validity. The correlation between emotional ambivalence and emotional stability is negative, as expected \( r = -.41, p < .01 \) for Study 1 and \( r = -.56, p < .01 \) for Study 2) respectively. Emotional stability is an indication of low neuroticism (Judge & Bono, 2001), and therefore emotional stability is conceptually the opposite of emotional ambivalence as defined before.

**Attitudes toward diversity.** To measure attitudes toward diversity (ATD), I used the 11 items scale adopted from Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen (2000a) with a 7-point scale \( (1 = \text{strongly disagree} \text{ and } 7 = \text{strongly agree}) \) with high scores indicating higher positive attitudes toward diversity. Examples of the items were: “Persons with disabilities can teach me things I could not learn elsewhere” and “Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our friendship.” The 11 items measured three different components: realistic appreciation, comfort with difference, and diversity of contact, and each component was measured with 4 items and 3 items only for diversity of contact component. The internal reliability for these components were 0.73, 0.83, and 0.73 respectively. The composite measure had a reliability level of \( \alpha = 0.76 \).

**Control variables.** I controlled for sex, general self-efficacy, and age because these variables are associated with emotional ambivalence (e.g. Fong, 2006; Aaker, Drolet, Griffin, 2008), bicultural identity integration (e.g. Miramontez et al., 2008), and attitude toward diversity (e.g. Flynn, 2005; Homan et al., 2008). Sex was coded 0 if male and 1 if female. Age was measured in years.

For self-efficacy, I used the 8-item measure of general self-efficacy developed by Chen, Gully, & Eden (2001). An example of an item is: “I will be able to achieve most of the goals that
I have set for myself.” Responses were in a seven-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). I averaged the responses to the eight items to create a scale for self-efficacy. The internal reliability for this scale was $\alpha = 0.91$.

Furthermore, I also controlled for personality factors including extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experiences as they play a role in the level of emotional ambivalence, and attitudes towards diversity (Strauss et al., 2003). To measure these personality dimensions I used a 10-items personality scale developed by Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann (2003). Examples of items are “I see myself as critical-quarrelsome”, “I see myself as dependable-self-disciplined.” Responses were in a seven-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Gosling et al. (2003) validated this measure compared to other personality measures (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1992) and found that this measure displayed convergence comparable to other measures (0.68 to 0.56). Internal reliability for this scale was $\alpha = 0.56$.

I also controlled for the essentialist belief about race, which refers to “the belief that race reflects a deep biological essence, is unchangeable, and is indicative of abilities and traits” (Haslam, Bastian, Bain, & Kashima, 2006; Choa, Chen, Roisman, & Hong, 2007). Choa et al. (2007) found that biculturals holding essentialist belief about their race perceive higher difficulty shifting between the ethnic and mainstream cultures that they are part of. Eight items developed by No & Hong (2005) were used to assess the essentialist belief about race. An example of an item is: “Races are just arbitrary categories and can be changed if necessary” and “Race does not have an inherent biological basis, and thus can be changed.” The measure had a 7-point scale (1= strongly disagree; 7= strongly agree). Items were averaged to show an overall score of essentialism belief about race. Internal reliability for this scale was $\alpha = 0.74$. 
To evaluate the validity of the emotional ambivalence measure, I correlated the measure I developed with an existing measure of emotional ambivalence (Rothman, 2011; Larsen et al., 2001). Results indicated a high correlation between the two measures ($r = .58, p < .01$), which provide evidence of convergent validity.

### 4.3 Preliminary Analyses - Study 1

#### 4.3.1 Sample characteristics

Prior to the analysis, bicultural identity integration, emotional ambivalence, attitude toward diversity and the control variables were all examined for the accuracy of data entry, missing data, normality, multivariate analysis assumptions, and univariate and multivariate outliers.

Accuracy of data entry was evaluated by checking minimum values, maximum values, standard deviation, and means for plausibility (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). I examined the VIF and tolerance values and I did not find any problems of multicollinerity, as VIF was below 10 (1.027) and Tolerance was higher than 0.1 (0.973). Data have also met the assumption of independent error (Durbin-Watson value =2). Finally by examining the scatterplot of standardized residuals, I concluded that the data met the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and linearity.

As for the missing data, there was about 1.22% missing values in this sample and that was corrected by using the expectation maximization method (EM) to replace the missing values. The EM method has two steps to replace the missing values: a) generation of values for missing parameters based on available data and b) maximization step in which new values were generated based on the newly imputed data and the observed data (Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2010).
In addition, items were examined for normality by using the skewedness, kurtosis and the histogram analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Standard deviation was also examined to ensure that the variance was equal at least to 1/5 of the range. By looking at the statistics of both the skewedness and the kurtosis scores and dividing the scores by the standard error the result indicated that many items were either positively or negatively skewed from the mean with z-scores beyond the threshold of 3.29 and – 3.29. These variables (i.e., experience, consciousness, and emotional stability) were transformed to obtain normal distribution. I applied the natural log transformation to correct for both negatively and positively skewed items (Greer, Dunlap, Hunter, and Berman, 2006).

To assess univariate and multivariate outliers’ visual tools such as box plots and quantitative techniques such as residual scores and Mahalanobis distance were used (Aguinis, Gottfredson, and Joo, 2013). As per the recommendation of Tabachnick & Fidell (2007), univariate outlier analysis was conducted first to detect any unusual values for any single variables. This analysis was carried out using a quantitative techniques like standardized z scores approach. This approach is considered an easy way to detect and then remove any observation that is below or above 3.29 and - 3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Based on this analysis there were 17 data points that were considered outliers and I chose to delete them because after examining their answers, it is evidently clear that participants didn’t fully understand the questions as their answers were always at the extreme end, and some of their answers were beyond the acceptable range. In addition, most of these 17 cases had many missing values. Two other cases were identified as multivariate outliers through Mahalanobis distance at p<.001. Multivariate outliers were evaluated using $\chi^2$ with degree of freedom equivalent to the number of variables. Any case greater than $\chi^2 (17) = 40.790$ is considered multivariate outliers (Tabachnick
& Fidell, 2007). All 19 outliers were removed, and the remaining sample was 155 (71 male and 84 female, mean age = 24.1, \(SD= 4.4\)). Following the recommendation of McConnell & Leibold (2009) of comparing the analysis before and after deleting outliers, I found the conclusions of the original data set to be still valid after the deletion of the outliers.

4.3.2 Model fit and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To evaluate the validity of the dependent variable (ATD), I conducted a three- and a one confirmatory factor analyses. The three-factor model, which included the three components of ATD (realistic appreciation, comfort with differences, diversity of contact) showed better fit [\(\chi^2 = 54.52, df= 41, \chi^2 /df= 1.330, CFI = 0.971, SRMR = .052, RMSEA = .039\)] than the one-factor model [\(\chi^2 = 249.158, df= 44, \chi^2 /df= 5.663, CFI=0.558, SRMR= .15, RMSEA = .174\)] The change in chi-square indicated a significant improvement between the hypothesized model and the independence model. Fig. 5.1 displays the standardized coefficients for this three-factor model.

In this model, I have dropped four items from the original 15-items measure of ATD because the loadings were below 0.50.

Furthermore, to examine the validity of the different measures used to test the hypotheses, I conducted a three-factor model with emotional ambivalence (EAX), bicultural identity integration (BII) and attitudes toward diversity (ATD), including a second order factor for attitudes toward diversity. The fit indices indicated a good overall fit for the three-factor model [\(\chi^2 = 178.67, df= 146, \chi^2 /df= 1.22; CFI = 0.972, SRMR= .0744, RMSEA=.046\)]. Fig. 5.2 displays the standardized coefficients for this model.

4.3.3 Analysis

The means, standard deviations, and correlations are shown in Table 2. These correlations show partial support of my hypotheses. There is a weak positive correlation between biculturalism and the last component of attitudes toward diversity (diversity of contact), \(r = .172\),
$p < .05$, whereas the correlation between bicultural identity integration and emotional ambivalence was negative, $r = -.26$, $p < .01$, as predicted.

I conducted a structural equation modeling (SEM) to test my theoretical model. SEM allows examining all the hypothesized relationships simultaneously taking into consideration the measurement error (Lemoine, Parsons, & Kansara, 2014). SEM was performed using AMOS 22 software. Wilcox, Howell & Breivik (2008) indicated that it is possible to fit formative measure in structural equation modeling. All the hypotheses were tested using SEM. To solve for negative variance between the error terms of two of three components of attitudes toward diversity, I imposed equality of error variance as they were found not to be significantly different from each other by comparing the critical ratio for differences (Arbuckle, 2005). A possible reason behind the negative variance between the error terms is the small sample size of the participants in this study ($N = 155$) (Arbuckle, 2005). The hypothesized model indicated good fit [$\chi^2 = 250.390$, df= 188, $\chi^2$/df= 1.332, SRMR= .0773, CFI=0.936, RMSEA=.046] (Model 1). I also conducted a second SEM in which I used the significant others’ ratings of ATD as the dependent variable (Model 2). The model showed even a better fit [$\chi^2 = 232.93$, df= 188, $\chi^2$/df= 1.24, SRMR= .0610, CFI=0.956, RMSEA=.039]. Models 1 and 2 are shown in Fig.5.3 and Fig. 5.4 respectively.

Hypothesis 1 stipulated that there was a positive relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. Contrary to what I expected, this relationship was not significant ($b = -0.122$, $p = .106$), and thus Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that bicultural identity integration (BII) would moderate the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. Before testing the moderation, the variables were centered as recommended by Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken (2003).
Moderation was tested using SPSS PROCESS version 11 (Hayes, 2013). Using model 1 in SPSS process, I estimated the conditional indirect effects of biculturalism on emotional ambivalence through the different levels of bicultural identity integration using unstandardized coefficients and bootstrapping with 1000 samples at 95% confidence interval. Based on the output (Table 3), there was no conditional effects of biculturalism on emotional ambivalence (coefficient = 0.0099; 95% CI = -0.0384, 0.0185) at the various levels of BII (low, medium, and high). Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Hypothesis 3 predicted a negative relationship between bicultural identity integration and emotional ambivalence. Based on the SEM results, there was a significant negative relationship between BII and emotional ambivalence (b = -.243, p < .05) indicating that Hypothesis 3 was supported.

Hypothesis 4 stated a positive relationship between biculturalism and attitudes toward diversity, but this relationship was not significant (b = .078, p = .467). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Hypothesis 5 proposed that emotional ambivalence mediated the joint effects of biculturalism and BII on attitudes toward diversity. Mediation was tested using process Macro (11) Hayes (2013) with model 4. I used unstandardized coefficients and bootstrapping with 1000 resamples at 95% confidence interval to estimate the conditional indirect effect of biculturalism on attitudes toward diversity (ATD) through emotional ambivalence. Table 4a shows that the mean indirect effects through emotional ambivalence (a x b = .0137), with a 95% confidence interval including zero (coefficient = 0.0137, 95% CI = -0.0071, 0.07). Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.
4.4 Preliminary Analyses Study 2

4.4.1 Sample characteristics

This sample was also examined for data entry accuracy, missing data, normality, multivariate analysis assumptions, and univariate and multivariate outliers. There were no issues regarding data entry as the minimum values, maximum values, and means were normal. I also used expectation maximization method (EM) to replace the missing values since I had only 1.728% of missing values (Schafer & Olsen, 1998). This method of handling missing data created more accurate parameter estimates (Schlomer et al., 2010).

Tabachnick & Fidell (2013) recommended checking normality after ensuring plausible range for the data. Normality was evaluated through skewedness and kurtosis. I transformed all the skewed variables by using the natural log transformation (Greer et al., 2006). After transformation, Q-Q plots and histograms indicated that all the variables had normal distributions. Furthermore, the P-P plots of the standardized residuals indicated that points were almost completely on the line.

Univariate outliers were examined by evaluating the standardized z scores. There were 6 cases with extremely either low or high z scores. In addition, there were two other cases that were identified as multivariate outliers through Mahalanobis distance p < .001. All eight cases were deleted, ending with a total of 129 (81 male and 48 female, mean age = 23.7, SD= 6.3) observations.

4.4.2 Model fit and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

I conducted a three-factor confirmatory factor analysis to assess the measurement structure of attitudes toward diversity (ATD). The three factor model showed an acceptable fit [$\chi^2 = 81.9334$, df= 39, $\chi^2$/df= 2.101, CFI=0.960, SRMR=.0825, RMSEA=.093]. There was a
significant improvement in the chi-square between the measurement model and the independence model. Fig 5.5 depicts the standardized coefficient for this model.

In this study, the validity of the different measures in the hypothesized model were also examined by running a three and a five-factor model. A second order structure was used to extract the three factors of the dependent variable for both models. The three-factor model had a better fit [$\chi^2 = 315.863$, df= 144, $\chi^2$/df= 2.19, CFI=0.914, SRMR=.1035, RMSEA=.097] than a five-factor model [$\chi^2 = 322.132$, df= 139, $\chi^2$/df= 2.32, CFI=0.908, SRMR=.0974, RMSEA=.101]. The fit for the three-factor model is acceptable although not as good as the fit for Study1. Fig. 5.6 show the CFA of the model.

4.4.3 Analysis

The means, standard deviations, and correlations are shown in Table 6. There is a strong positive correlation between biculturalism (IV) and attitudes toward diversity (DV) was $r = .75$, $p < .01$ and strong negative correlation between biculturalism (IV) and emotional ambivalence (mediator) was $r = -.69$, $p < .01$, which is very high. However, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013: 90), “the statistical problem created by singularity and collinearity occur at much higher correlations (.90 and higher)”. The collinearity diagnostics suggested no evidence of collinearity as VIF = 1.88 (associated with a threshold of 10 or less) and tolerance was .53 (associated with a threshold of more than 0.1; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). As expected a strong negative relationship between bicultural identity integration (BII) and emotional ambivalence $r = -.48$, $p < .01$.

To test the hypothetical model, I conducted a structural equation modeling (SEM). SEM was performed using AMOS 22 software. As done in the previous study and to solve for negative variance, I imposed equality of error variance as they were found not to be significantly
different from each other by comparing the critical ratio for differences (Arbuckle, 2005). The model indicated acceptable fit \([\chi^2 = 317.169, \text{df}= 158, \chi^2 /\text{df}= 2.007, \text{SRMR}= .0877, \text{CFI}=0.934, \text{RMSEA}= .089]\]. Fig 5.8 below shows the SEM model for the second study.

Supporting the correlation results and contrary to what was expected, the regression analysis indicated that there is a negative relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence \((b= -.686, p<.001)\) and thus Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2 postulated that bicultural identity integration (BII) would moderate the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. Moderation was tested using SPSS Process Macro version 11 (Hayes, 2013). Using model 1 in process, I centered the variables to test for moderation (Cohen et al., 2003), and I estimated the conditional indirect effects of biculturalism on emotional ambivalence through the various level of bicultural identity integration using unstandardized coefficients and bootstrapping with 1000 samples at 95% confidence interval. The results on Table 5 shows that there is an interactions effects at the different level of bicultural identity integration. The conditional effects of biculturalism on emotional ambivalence were significant \((\text{coefficient } = 0.4156; 95\% \text{ CI } = .0592, 0.7720)\) at all the various level of BII (low, medium, and high) but the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence is negative. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported and therefore BII moderates the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. Fig 5.7 shows graphically the interaction effect.

The negative relationship between bicultural identity integration and emotional ambivalence (H3) was significant and negative as hypothesized. Furthermore, Based on the regression results from the SEM, the relationship between BII and emotional ambivalence was negative and significant \((b= -.416, p<.01)\), and Hypothesis 3 was supported.
Hypothesis 4 predicted a positive relationship between biculturalism and attitudes toward diversity and the regression results based on the SEM output indicated a significant positive relationship as hypothesized (b=1.165, \(p<.001\)). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Hypothesis 5 proposed that emotional ambivalence mediates the joint effects of biculturalism and BII on attitudes toward diversity. Mediation was tested using process macro in SPSS version (11) Hayes (2013) with model 4. I used unstandardized coefficients and bootstrapping with 1000 resamples at 95% confidence interval to estimate the conditional indirect effects of biculturalism on attitudes toward diversity (ATD) through emotional ambivalence. Table 4b shows that there are no indirect effects (coefficient= 0.1719, 95% CI = -0.0426, 0.4622). In addition, by using the bias-corrected percentile method from Amos output and by examining the two tailed significance of the indirect effects, I found also no indirect effects from biculturalism to attitudes toward diversity through emotional ambivalence. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Table 7. Shows a summary of the results for both studies.
Chapter 5 – Discussion

5.1 General Discussion

Across both studies, and as expected, I found a negative relationship between the different levels of bicultural identity integration and emotional ambivalence. These findings support my theory that those who perceive the two cultures to be complementary rather than oppositional face less conflicting emotions.

There were different results between the two studies. I found moderation effects of bicultural identity integration on the relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence in Study 2 but not in Study 1. These differences can be attributed to different factors. First, Study 1’s sample (international students) differed from Study 2’s (College of Business administration’s students) sample as participants predominantly belong to two major cultural groups. However, participants in Study 2 belong to a variety of cultural groups and many of them are very different from the host culture (U.S. culture). Despite belonging to two different cultures, participants of Study 1 may not have been exposed to diversity at the same level as participants of Study 2. The reason behind that can be attributed to the fact that the two cultures are in close geographical proximity to each other where cultural differences exist but are not as obvious as for participants in Study 2. Second, examining the inter-correlation tables of both studies, I realized that the SD of the dependent variables (ATD) is different between Study 1 (0.51) and Study 2 (0.80). Therefore, the first sample is more homogenous than the second sample in attitudes toward diversity.

I did not find any significant positive relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence across both Study 1 and Study 2. To the contrary, Study 1 revealed a negative but not significant relationship between the two variables, whereas Study 2 showed a significant negative relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence. These findings can be
attributed to the fact that individuals trying to function in a new culture, will experience identity conflict which in turn may lead to distress and anxiety (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). However, with time these individuals may experience less identity conflict and hence less emotional ambivalence. Biculturals shift their interpretive cultural frameworks in a daily basis (Hong et al., 2000) and as mentioned before that can be stressful (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998) and may elicit emotional ambivalence. However, the occurrences of stress and emotional ambivalence can be alleviated due the repetitively confronting situations that elicit cultural conflict in a daily basis. People in general and biculturals in particular will have less emotional impact from previously experienced conflicting situations and that can also help them in having less emotional impact from similar conflicting situations even if not experienced before. Therefore, as biculturalism increases throughout time there will be a reduction in the level of emotional ambivalence experienced.

Finally, there was also no mediation effects of emotional ambivalence between biculturalism and attitudes toward diversity in both studies. These results can be linked to the unexpected negative relationships between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence.

5.2 Contributions and Implications

These studies contributed to the development of theory by exploring whether cultural identification, such as biculturalism and bicultural identity integration, can affect emotional ambivalence and ultimately attitudes toward diversity. Second, I integrated social identity theory (Turner, Brown and Tajfel 1979; Tajfel, 1981), the frame switching model (Hong et al., 2000), and affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) to explain why biculturalism and bicultural identity integration relate to attitudes toward diversity mediated by emotional ambivalence. Even though results didn’t support the hypothesis, integrating these three theories
can still provide a general understanding of why biculturalism can have an impact in emotions and hence on work attitudes such attitudes toward diversity.

Previous literature on ambivalence has examined the role of ambivalent attitudes towards minorities (Bagozzi et al., 1999), but to my knowledge there is no work examining the association between bicultural individuals and experiencing emotional ambivalence. Kramer et al. (2009) investigated the biculturals’ coping levels to ambivalent messages rather than experiencing emotional ambivalence. Furthermore, the theory of emotional ambivalence discussed the affective aspects of the perception between the host and the ethnic cultures (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005), which is different from experiencing emotional ambivalence. Social identity theory emphasized the emotional importance of identifying with a particular group, without taking into consideration the integration of different cultural identities (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011). Therefore, the integration of the three theories represents a significant addition to the understanding of emotional ambivalence.

I build a new model introducing a new construct – emotional ambivalence - and examining bicultural identity integration in a new context (Colquitt & Zapata, 2007). I built my model drawing from prior theoretical frameworks, which focus on understanding how and why biculturalism relates to emotions and attitudes towards diversity in work settings. However, this model can be applicable to different settings besides work setting. For instance, taking a purchasing decision for a bicultural may entail him/her to evaluate such a decision by evaluating both cultures’ schema. This unique experience can take place even at home especially if biculturals are socializing with people from both cultures.

Empirically, I contributed to the frame switching model (Hong et al., 2000), which argues that bicultural individuals switch between the two internalized cultures (interpretive
frameworks) to guide their feelings and thoughts (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). In particular, prior literature stated that biculturals with low BII have conflict integrating the two cultural frameworks (Haritatos & Benet-Martinez, 2002; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). In this dissertation, I hypothesize and found the effects of such conflict on emotions which is an extension to model that focused mainly on the cognitive aspects of BII. The significant negative relationship between bicultural identity integration and emotional ambivalence depict the relationship between cultural frame switching and emotion.

These studies also offered a methodological contribution to the literature. I developed and validated a measure of emotional ambivalence. I presented evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity as well as internal and test-retest reliability. This measure focuses on measuring the level of experiencing emotional ambivalence rather than trying to elicit such emotion as done in previous studies (i.e., Fong, 2006; Rothman, 2011).

One theoretical implication of this dissertation relates to the prediction that bicultural identity integration would be negatively related to emotional ambivalence, which was supported in both studies. This finding suggests that bicultural individuals who are well versed in both cultures experience less conflicting emotions in their daily interactions in both cultures, and therefore they are better prepared to face intercultural encounters. Further research may examine the contingent factors that may affect this relationship, such as the effect of time exposure in a new culture.

In future research, I may examine some of the significant findings that were not hypothesized in this dissertation. Of a particular interest to me is the relationship between emotional ambivalence and attitudes toward diversity, which was significantly negative in one of the studies. Such a finding can be expected due to the amount of emotional and cognitive
resources drawn by the individual experiencing emotional ambivalence, which in turn affects the level of attitudes toward diversity. Experiencing emotional ambivalence can be exhausting and tiresome and therefore the amount of cognitive and emotional resources that are directed toward alleviating emotional ambivalence can distract individuals from putting the efforts to establish positive relationships with dissimilar others. Also knowing that emotional ambivalence is mainly triggered because of the conflicting cultural interpretive frameworks can discourage individuals from interacting with dissimilar others because they have developed a negative connotation with having to deal with more than one cultural frameworks.

These studies have various practical implications. Identifying various antecedents and moderators of attitudes toward diversity can help organizations design effective training programs to successfully interact with diverse others and subsequently improve organizational outcomes (Sawyer et al., 2005). Being biculturals basically means being able to integrate two cultures which in turn help biculturals to have a more positive attitudes toward diversity. Therefore offering cultural training can help employees to integrate with cultures beside theirs and hence develop a more positive attitudes toward diversity. In addition, as diversity is rapidly increasing among developed countries, especially the United States, (Grieco & Cassidy, 2001; Nakui, Paulus, & Van Der Zee, 2011) it is becoming also important to understand how people feel toward diverse others and what influences their attitudes and feelings (Strauss and Connerley, 2003).

Another implication is that organizations can better understand the possible results of belonging to two different cultures, and how can this quality be employed to benefit the organizations. For instance, based on both studies, individuals who have high identification with both cultures can face less conflicting emotions at work and that can result in better collaboration
with others because less cognitive resources are directed towards settling the conflicting emotions. Finally, as I found in both studies, bicultural identity integration is negatively related to emotional ambivalence. This finding suggests that organizations, especially multinational corporations operating in different countries, can better place bicultural individuals experiencing less conflicting emotions with different cultures in international assignments. These biculturals experiencing less conflicting emotions due to their high cultural integration can adjust and integrate faster while in international assignments. Even though my predictions were not supported but based on the results, having less experiences of emotional ambivalence and being able to integrate quickly into the foreign culture will help them to direct their full attention toward their work tasks and hence be more effective and productive. Also, no cognitive or emotional resources will be directed toward alleviating emotional ambivalence.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

The conclusions drawn from this research are based on student’s samples, which can limit the generalizability of the findings as the mean age for both samples was 24.1 and 23.7 for Study 1 and Study 2 respectively. These samples represent only the youth population who may not have long work experiences, limited travel, and hence less exposure to diversity. However, due to the fact that collecting data from employees can be very difficult and therefore the findings of this research are still valuable as they help in broadening our understanding of the characteristics associated with bicultural individuals. Future research may examine this subject with employees’ sample.

Another limitation of this dissertation is that the findings are based on cross sectional data. With this research design, it is difficult to make causal inferences and it is a snap shot of the situation as results may differ if the same questionnaire is given in a different time frame. I tried
to lessen this problem by collecting data at two different points in time with a two-week temporal gap. In future research, I will conduct a longitudinal data collection with a longer time gap to confidently be able to draw causal inferences and indicates and long-term changes. Using surveys to collect data from both the independent and dependent variables drawing from the same respondents is another limitation, as results may be partially a function of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Different recommended approaches were utilized to avoid CMV such as mixing the questions, and collecting data in different time frames (Study 1). Despite the possible presence of common method variance, there are no reasons to expect that common method bias will create artificial interaction effects because of the different approaches taken to avoid and correct for CMV (Siemsen, Roth, and Oliveira, 2010). Also, I limited my examination to attitudes toward diversity, without explaining work behaviors and since organizations are more concerned with knowing the possible behaviors emerging from different attitudes that can be considered a limitations. Future studies can examine work behaviors, such as organizational citizenship behavior, besides examining the effects on work attitudes as was done in these studies.

Another possible limitation is the high positive correlation between biculturalism (IV) and attitudes toward diversity (DV; r = .75, p < .01) and the strong negative correlation between biculturalism (IV) and emotional ambivalence (mediator; r = -.69, p < .01). However, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013: 90), “the statistical problem created by singularity and collinearity occur at much higher correlations (.90 and higher)”.

5.4 Conclusion

In summary, both studies indicated that the way biculturals perceive their cultures affect the way they develop their emotions. However, due to sample differences, there were mixed results between the two studies. Therefore, and because of the lack of significant findings across
both studies, researchers should continue to investigate how biculturalism can affect emotions and subsequently different work attitudes and behaviors.
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Appendix

Appendix A. Surveys

Survey time 1 for COBA Students

The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Institutional Review Board Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects Protocol Title: The integrated effects of Biculturalism, emotional ambivalence, and bicultural identity integration on attitudes toward diversity.

Principal investigator: Mr. Said Al-Riyami UTEP: Department of Marketing and Management

You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research project described below. Please take your time making a decision and feel free to discuss it with your friends and family. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form that describes the study. Please ask the study researcher or the study staff to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

You have been asked to take part in a research study related to the impact of cultures on the workplace. Approximately, 200 students will be enrolling in this study. You are being asked to be in the study because you are a current student on the UTEP campus. If you decide to enroll in this study, your involvement will last about 45 minutes for both surveys. If you agree to take part in this study, the researcher will give you access to two online surveys to complete. Your responses will remain confidential and there should be minimal to no risk for participating in this study. All protected measures will be taken to preserve your privacy and confidentiality. Both Surveys will be anonymous where no personal information that can help to identify you will be required. Upon completion of the two surveys you will be receiving extra credit for your class. In addition, those students who manage to bring a significant other to answer the online survey on their behalf's will be eligible for another extra credit.

The University of Texas at El Paso and its affiliates do not offer to pay for or cover the cost of medical treatment for research related illness or injury. No funds have been set aside to pay or reimburse you in the event of such injury or illness. You will not give up any of your legal rights by signing this consent form. You should report any such injury to Mr. Said Al-Riyami at (915) 747- 6038 and to the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915)747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu.
The answers received will assist the researcher in understanding the impact of cultures on work settings. Upon completion of both parts of the survey, you will be given extra credit from your instructor. In addition to the extra credit, your participation will play a role in UTEP meeting the University's goal of becoming a Tier 1 university. Upon request, the research team will also share the results of the study at the completion of the research project.

Should you decide not to participate in this voluntary study, you may read a 3-page case and respond to 2 questions regarding this case in each of the two phases of this study for a total of 2 cases and 4 questions. Your involvement in this alternative assignment will last 45 minutes. You may decide not to participate at all. There will be no penalties involved for not participating. However, you will not be granted the extra credit.

Students who decide not to participate in both surveys, will not be asked to bring a significant other as other students who participated in both surveys and as an alternative for them they will be given a chance to read a third case study and to answer two questions for more extra credits. For those students who answer the two surveys and opt not to bring a significant other to answer the survey on their behalf will be also given one case study to read and to answer two questions to earn extra credit.

There are no direct costs to you for participating in this study. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may call Mr. Said Al-Riyami at (915) 747-6038. If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915) 747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

Your responses will remain confidential and there should be minimal to no risk to your confidentiality. None of the information will identify you by name. All records will be destroyed upon finishing the study. The principal investigator, Mr. Said Al-Riyami, will be the only person with access to the data. Only average results will be reported.

I have read each page of this paper about the study (or it was read to me). I know that being in this study is voluntary and I choose to be in this study. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I will get a copy of this consent form now and can get information of the results of the study later if I wish. By entering my name at the end of this form I am giving my consent to participate in this research.
1- We need your name and address so that we can administer the extra credit. We will only use your e-mail address to interact with you if needed.

2- What is your Last Name?

3- What is your First Name?

4- What is your email address?

5- What is your UTEP ID #?

Do you want the University of Texas at El Paso to reach a Tier 1 status? By participating in this research, you will help in the accomplishment of this important goal.

The questions asked in this survey will help us understand the impact of different types of perceptions in work settings. Your responses are a key component to this ongoing research.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to answer these questions.

The first set of question relates to your demographics and life history.

**Biculturals** are those who identify with **two different cultures**. Both cultures guide bicultural thoughts, feelings and behavior. Bicultural feels equally comfortable in any of the two different cultural contexts. With this information in mind, please answer the following questions:

1. Have you lived in more than one country for more than 3 consecutive months?  
   - [X] Yes  
   - [ ] No
2. In which languages do you fluently speak?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In which languages do you fluently write?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Approximately how long have you lived in the USA (in years)?

The next questions are about the **two cultures you belong to**. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel caught between the (first) and the (second) cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel like someone moving between two cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being a bicultural means having two cultural forces pulling on me at the same time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel conflicted between the (my first culture’s) and the (second culture’s) ways of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel torn between (my first) and (my second) cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001)

The Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about yourself:
New Developed Measures for evaluating emotional ambivalence experiences.

The next set of questions relates to emotional ambivalence, which is defined as “the expression of tension and conflict which result from the simultaneous experience of two emotional states that primarily differ in valence” (Rothman, 2011). It takes place when a person feel conflicting emotions (i.e. Sad and happy) at the same time.

Please answer the following set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (0 times)</th>
<th>Rarely (1 or 2 times)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3 to 5 times)</th>
<th>Often (6 to 9 times)</th>
<th>More than 9 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do you experienced emotional ambivalence?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I experienced mixed feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. I experienced conflicting emotions simultaneously.

The next question is about your feeling. Please indicate the current level of your emotion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Not ambivalent at all</th>
<th>Very Ambivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How ambivalent (having mixed emotions) do you feel right now?</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Not torn at all</th>
<th>Very torn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How torn do you feel right now?</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Not conflicted at all</th>
<th>Very conflicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. How conflicted do you feel right now?</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Essentialist belief about Race (No & Hong, 2005)

The next questions are about you. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To a large extent, a person’s race biologically determines his or her abilities and traits.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Although a person can adapt to different cultures, it is hard if not impossible to change the dispositions of a person’s race.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How a person is like (e.g., his or her abilities, traits) is deeply ingrained in his or her race. It cannot be changed much.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A person’s race is something very basic about them and it can’t be changed much.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Races are just arbitrary categories and can be changed if necessary.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Racial categories are constructed totally for economic, political, and social reasons. If the socio-political situation changes, the racial categories will change as well.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Race does not have an inherent biological basis, and thus can be changed.

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

8. Racial categories are fluid, malleable constructs.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
Control Variables

1. What is your age? 

2. What is your Gender?
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

3. What is your racial/ethnic background?
   African American
   Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
   Asian
   Hispanic
   Others (please specify) _______________________________

4. Are you currently working?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

5. What kind of Job do you have?
   Full-time Job ○
   Part-time Job ○
   I don't have a Job ○

6. What is your position at your current company?
   Employee ○
   Supervisor ○
   Other (please specify) ○

7. Approximately, how many (years) of work experience do you have? 

8. Are you a US citizen?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Thank you for your participation! Please let us know if you have any comments about the survey.
Survey time 2 for COBA Students

You are going to participate in the second and last phase of a study related to the impact culture on the workplace. We appreciate your participation. As a reminder, you will be granted extra credit if you participate in both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the survey.

1- We need your name and address so that we can administer the extra credit. We will only use your e-mail address to interact with you if needed.

2- What is your Last Name?

3- What is your First Name?

4- What is your email address?

5- What is your UTEP ID #?

Attitudes Toward Diversity (Fuertes et al. (2000a))
The Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Persons with disabilities can teach me things I could not learn elsewhere.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can best understand someone after I get to know how he/she is both similar and different from me.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowing how a person differs from me greatly enhances our friendship.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In getting to know someone, I like knowing both how he/she differs from me and is similar to me.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knowing about the different experiences of other people helps me understand my own problems better.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Getting to know someone of another race is generally an uncomfortable experience for me.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am only at ease with people of my race.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It's really hard for me to feel close to a person from another race.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is very important that a friend agrees with me on most issues.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I often feel irritated by persons of a different race.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from different countries.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would like to go to dances that feature music from other countries.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I often listen to music of other cultures.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I see myself as extraverted, enthusiastic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I see myself as critical, quarrelsome.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I see myself as dependable, self-disciplined.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I see myself as anxious, easily upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I see myself as open to new experiences, complex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I see myself as reserved, quiet.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I see myself as disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I see myself as disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I see myself as calm, emotionally stable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I see myself as conventional, uncreative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Developed Measures for evaluating emotional ambivalence experiences.

The next set of questions relates to emotional ambivalence, which is defined as “the expression of tension and conflict which result from the simultaneous experience of two emotional states that primarily differ in valence” (Rothman, 2011). It takes place when a person feel conflicting emotions (i.e. Sad and happy) at the same time.

Please answer the following set of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the last month:</th>
<th>Never (0 times)</th>
<th>Rarely (1 or 2 times)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3 to 5 times)</th>
<th>Often (6 to 9 times)</th>
<th>More than 9 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do you experienced emotional ambivalence?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I experienced mixed feelings.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I experienced conflicting emotions simultaneously.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation! Please let us know if you have any comments about the survey.
Survey for COBA Students’ significant others

Principle investigator: Mr. Said Al-Riyami UTEP: Department of Marketing and Management

You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research project described below. Please take your time making a decision and feel free to discuss it with your friends and family. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form that describes the study. Please ask the study researcher or the study staff to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

You have been asked to take part in a research study related to the impact of cultures on the workplace. Approximately, 200 participants will be enrolling in this study. You are being asked to be in the study because you are identified as a significant other to a current student on the UTEP campus. If you decide to enroll in this study, your involvement will last approximately 25 minutes. If you agree to take part in this study, the researcher will give you access to one online surveys to complete. Your responses will remain confidential and there should be minimal to no risk for participating in this study. All protected measures will be taken to preserve your privacy and confidentiality. The survey will be anonymous where no personal information that can help to identify you will be required. Upon completion of the survey you will be receiving a $10 gift card.

The University of Texas at El Paso and its affiliates do not offer to pay for or cover the cost of medical treatment for research related illness or injury. No funds have been set aside to pay or reimburse you in the event of such injury or illness. You will not give up any of your legal rights by signing this consent form. You should report any such injury to Mr. Said Al-Riyami at (915) 747- 6038 and to the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915) 747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

The answers received will assist the researcher in understanding the impact of different cultures on work settings. Upon completion of the survey, you will be receiving a $10 gift card. In addition to the gift card, your participation will play a role in UTEP meeting the University's goal of becoming a Tier 1 university. Upon request, the research team will also share the results of the study at the completion of the research project.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and there will be no penalties involved for not participating.
There are no direct costs to you for participating in this study. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may call Mr. Said Al-Riyami at (915) 747-6038. If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915) 747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

Your responses will remain confidential and there should be minimal to no risk to your confidentiality. None of the information will identify you by name. All records will be destroyed upon finishing the study. The principal investigator, Mr. Said Al-Riyami, will be the only person with access to the data. Only average results will be reported.

I have read each page of this paper about the study (or it was read to me). I know that being in this study is voluntary and I choose to be in this study. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I will get a copy of this consent form now and can get information of the results of the study later if I wish. By entering my name at the end of this form I am giving my consent to participate in this research.

1- What is Your Last Name?

2- What is Your First Name?

We would like you to answer the following questions about the person who asked you to answer this survey as you know very well. Please answer all the questions to the best of your knowledge.

3- What is the Last Name of person who asked you to answer this survey?

4- What is the First Name of the person who asked you to answer this survey?

5- What is the student's ID number of the person who asked you to answer this survey?
6- What is your **relationship** to the participant for whom you are answering this survey?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>〇</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife or Husband</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son or Daughter</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt or Uncle</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant other</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommate</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmate</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7- How long have you known this person (in years)?

8- Are you currently living with this person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9- Have you ever lived with this person before?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10- If yes, for how long have you lived with this person? (in years)

11- How well do you know this person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Extremely well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>〇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The first set of question relates to the demographics and life history of the person who asked you to answer this survey. In particular, we are interested in the present time.

To answer the following questions, please consider the following definition: **Biculturals** are those who identify with **two different cultures** where both cultures guide bicultural thoughts, feelings and behavior. Biculturals feel equally comfortable in any of the two different cultural contexts. With this information in mind, please answer the following questions:

1. **Do you consider this person bicultural?**  
   ![Yes][1] ![No][2]

2. **Have this person lived in more than one country for more than 3 consecutive months?**  
   ![Yes][1] ![No][2]

3. **If you answered “Yes” to Question 3, what are those countries?**
   - Country 1  
   - Country 2  
   - Country 3

4. **What are the cultures that you believe this person belong to?**
   - Culture 1  
   - Culture 2  
   - Culture 3

5. **In which languages does this person fluently speak?**
   - Language 1  
   - Language 2  
   - Language 3

6. **In which languages does this person fluently write?**
   - Language 1  
   - Language 2  
   - Language 3
7. Is **this person** a citizen of more than one country?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. What is **this person's** citizenship? Alternatively, if **this person** have more than one citizenship, what are his/her citizenships?

| Nationality 1 |---------------------------------|
| Nationality 2 |---------------------------------|
| Nationality 3 |---------------------------------|

9. What is the citizenship of **this person's** father?

| Citizenship 1 |---------------------------------|
| Citizenship 2 |---------------------------------|
| Citizenship 3 |---------------------------------|

10. What is the citizenship of **this person's** mother?

| Citizenship 1 |---------------------------------|
| Citizenship 2 |---------------------------------|
| Citizenship 3 |---------------------------------|

11. Approximately how long does **this person** lived in the USA (in years)?

The next questions are about the **two cultures this person belongs to**. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that this person is caught between the (first) and the (second) cultures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that this person is like someone moving between two cultures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. For this person, being a bicultural means having two cultural forces pulling on me at the same time.

4. This person feels conflicted between the (my first culture’s) and the (second culture’s) ways of doing things.

5. This person feels torn between (my first) and (my second) cultures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Persons with disabilities can teach this person things he could not learn elsewhere.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This person can best understand someone after he/she gets to know how he/she is both similar and different from him/her.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowing how a person differs from this person greatly enhances their friendship.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. In getting to know someone, this person likes knowing both how he/she differs from himself/herself and is similar to him/her.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Knowing about the different experiences of other people helps this person understand his/her own problems better.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Getting to know someone of another race is generally an uncomfortable experience for this person.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. This person is only at ease with people of his/her own race.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. It’s really hard for this person to feel close to a person from another race.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. It is very important that a friend agrees with this person on most issues.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. This person often feel irritated by persons of a different race.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. This person would like to join an organization that emphasizes getting to know people from different countries.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. This person would like to go to dances that feature music from other countries.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. This person often listens to music of other cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. This person is interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. This person attends events where he/she might get to know people from different racial backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001)

The Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about this person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This person will be able to achieve most of the goals that he/she has set for himself/herself.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When facing difficult tasks, this person is certain that he/she will accomplish them.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In general, this person thinks that he/she can obtain outcomes that are important to him/her.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This person believes he/she can succeed at most any endeavor to which he/she set his/her mind.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This person will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This person is confident that he/she can perform effectively on many different tasks.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compared to other people, this person can do most tasks very well.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Even when things are tough, this person can perform quite well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Essentialist belief about Race (No & Hong, 2005)

The next questions are about this person. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For this person and to a large extent, person’s race biologically determines his or her abilities and traits.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Although a person can adapt to different cultures, this person believes it is hard if not impossible to change the dispositions of a person’s race.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This person believes how a person is like (e.g., his or her abilities, traits) is deeply ingrained in his or her race. It cannot be changed much.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This person believes that a person’s race is something very basic about them and it can’t be changed much.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. This person believes that races are just arbitrary categories and can be changed if necessary.  

6. This person believes that racial categories are constructed totally for economic, political, and social reasons. If the socio-political situation changes, the racial categories will change as well.  

7. This person believes that race does not have an inherent biological basis, and thus can be changed.  

8. This person believes that racial categories are fluid, malleable constructs.
Big five Personality  (Gosling et al., 2003)

The next questions are about this person. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I see this person as extraverted, enthusiastic.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I see this person as critical, quarrelsome.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I see this person as dependable, self-disciplined.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I see this person as anxious, easily upset.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I see this person as open to new experiences, complex.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I see this person as reserved, quiet.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I see this person as disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I see this person as disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I see this person as calm, emotionally stable.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I see this person as conventional, uncreative.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation! Please let us know if you have any comments about the survey.
Survey for International Students

The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Institutional Review Board Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects Protocol Title: The integrated effects of Biculturalism, emotional ambivalence, and bicultural identity integration on attitudes toward diversity.

Principal investigator: Mr. Said Al-Riyami
UTEP: Department of Marketing and Management

You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research project described below. Please take your time making a decision and feel free to discuss it with your friends and family. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form that describes the study. Please ask the study researcher or the study staff to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

You have been asked to take part in a research study related to the impact of cultures on the workplace. Approximately, 200 students will be enrolling in this study. You are being asked to be in the study because you are a current international student on the UTEP campus. If you decide to enroll in this study, your involvement will last about 25 minutes. If you agree to take part in this study, the researcher will give you access to one online survey to complete. Your responses will remain confidential and there should be minimal to no risk for participating in this study. All protected measures will be taken to preserve your privacy and confidentiality. The Survey will be anonymous where no personal information that can help to identify you will be required. Upon completion of the survey you will be entitled to get a $5 gift card.

The University of Texas at El Paso and its affiliates do not offer to pay for or cover the cost of medical treatment for research related illness or injury. No funds have been set aside to pay or reimburse you in the event of such injury or illness. You will not give up any of your legal rights by signing this consent form. You should report any such injury to Mr. Said Al-Riyami at (915) 747-6038 and to the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915) 747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

The answers received will assist the researcher in understanding the impact of different cultures on work settings. Your participation will play a role for better understanding of the implication of bicultural identity on the work settings. Upon request, the research team will also share the results of the study at the completion of the research project.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and there will be no penalties involved for not participating.

There are no direct costs to you for participating in this study. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may call Mr. Said Al-Riyami at (915) 747-6038. If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915) 747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu.
Your responses will remain confidential and there should be minimal to no risk to your confidentiality. None of the information will identify you by name. All records will be destroyed upon finishing the study. The principal investigator, Mr. Said Al-Riyami, will be the only person with access to the data. Only average results will be reported.

I have read each page of this paper about the study (or it was read to me). I know that being in this study is voluntary and I choose to be in this study. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I will get a copy of this consent form now and can get information of the results of the study later if I wish. **By entering my name** at the end of this form I am giving my consent to participate in this research.

6- We need your name and address so that we can administer the extra credit. We will only use your e-mail address to interact with you if needed.

7- What is your Last Name?

8- What is your First Name?

9- What is your email address?

10- What is your UTEP ID #?

Do you want the University of Texas at El Paso to reach a Tier 1 status? By participating in this research, you will help in the accomplishment of this important goal.

The questions asked in this survey will help us understand the impact of different types of perceptions in work settings. Your responses are a key component to this ongoing research.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to answer these questions.
The first set of question relates to your demographics and life history.

**Biculturals** are those who identify with **two different cultures**. Both cultures guide bicultural thoughts, feelings and behavior. Bicultural feels equally comfortable in any of the two different cultural contexts. With this information in mind, please answer the following questions:

1. Have you lived in more than one country for more than 3 consecutive months?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

2. In which languages do you fluently speak?  
   - Language 1  
   - Language 2  
   - Language 3

3. In which languages do you fluently write?  
   - Language 1  
   - Language 2  
   - Language 3

4. Approximately how long have you lived in the USA (in years)?
The next questions are about the **two cultures you belong to**. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel caught between the (first) and the (second) cultures.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel like someone moving between two cultures.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being a bicultural means having two cultural forces pulling on me at the same time.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel conflicted between the (my first culture’s) and the (second culture’s) ways of doing things.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel torn between (my first) and (my second) cultures.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001)

The please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Developed Measures for evaluating emotional ambivalence experiences.

The next set of questions relates to **emotional ambivalence**, which is defined as “the expression of tension and conflict which result from the simultaneous experience of two emotional states that primarily differ in valence” (Rothman, 2011). It takes place when a person feel conflicting emotions (i.e. Sad and happy) at the same time.

Please answer the following set of questions:

### During the *last month*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never (0 times)</th>
<th>Rarely (1 or 2 times)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3 to 5 times)</th>
<th>Often (6 to 9 times)</th>
<th>More than 9 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do you experienced emotional ambivalence?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I experienced mixed feelings.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I experienced conflicting emotions simultaneously.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question is about **your feeling**. Please indicate the current level of your emotion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Not ambivalent at all</th>
<th>Very Ambivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How ambivalent (having mixed emotions) do you feel right now?</td>
<td>① 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Not torn at all</th>
<th>Very torn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How torn do you feel right now?</td>
<td>① 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Not conflicted at all</td>
<td>Very conflicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How conflicted do you feel right now?</td>
<td>① 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Essentialist belief about Race (No & Hong, 2005)

The next questions are about you. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To a large extent, a person’s race biologically determines his or her abilities and traits.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Although a person can adapt to different cultures, it is hard if not impossible to change the dispositions of a person’s race.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How a person is like (e.g., his or her abilities, traits) is deeply ingrained in his or her race. It cannot be changed much.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A person’s race is something very basic about them and it can’t be changed much.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Races are just arbitrary categories and can be changed if necessary.</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Racial categories are constructed totally for economic, political, and social reasons. If the socio-political situation changes, the racial</td>
<td>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories will change as well.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Race does not have an inherent biological basis, and thus can be changed.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
<td>⑦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Racial categories are fluid, malleable constructs.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
<td>⑦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Variables

9. What is your age? 

10. What is your Gender?

☐ Male  ☐ Female

11. What is your racial/ethnic background?

African American
Caucasian (non- Hispanic)
Asian
Hispanic
Others (please specify) _____________________________

12. Are you currently working?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

13. What kind of Job do you have?

Full-time Job  ☐
Part-time Job  ☐
I don't have a Job  ☐

14. What is your position at your current company?

Employee  ☐
Supervisor  ☐
Other (please specify)  ☐

15. Approximately, how many (years) of work experience do you have?

16. Are you a US citizen?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Thank you for your participation! Please let us know if you have any comments about the survey.
Appendix B: Tables

Table 1. Correlation between items measuring biculturalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BICUL1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BICUL2</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BICUL3</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.630**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 2. Inter-correlations and Descriptive Statistics (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>BICUL</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>ATD</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>BII</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>EAX</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.245**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>EXTROVER_S</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>AGREEABLE_S</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>CONSC_S</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>EMOTIONAL_STAB</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.405**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-</td>
<td>OPEN_TO_EXP</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.379**</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.158*</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.173**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-</td>
<td>SELF_EFFICACY</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.281**</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-</td>
<td>EBR</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-</td>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>-.161*</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.830**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-</td>
<td>SEX a</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.158*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-</td>
<td>ATD-DC</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.172*</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.205*</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 155. \)

*Sex was coded 1 if female and 0 if male.

\* \( p \leq .05, ** \( p \leq .01, *** \( p \leq .001. \) Two-tailed tests.
Table 3. Bootstrap Results for the Conditional Effects (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BII</th>
<th>Conditional effects</th>
<th>Se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>LLCI 95%</th>
<th>ULCI 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8978</td>
<td>0.4348</td>
<td>0.2847</td>
<td>-1.5271</td>
<td>-0.9974</td>
<td>0.1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2548</td>
<td>-0.4215</td>
<td>0.2045</td>
<td>-2.0613</td>
<td>-0.8254</td>
<td>0.0175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6119</td>
<td>-0.4081</td>
<td>0.2725</td>
<td>-1.4977</td>
<td>-0.9464</td>
<td>0.1303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL= lower limit, UL= upper limit. Bootstrap sample size 1,000.

Table 4a. Indirect effect of Biculturalism on Attitudes toward Diversity (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAX</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
<td>-0.0071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL= lower limit, UL= upper limit, CI= Confidence Interval. Bootstrap sample size 1,000.

Table 4b. Indirect effect of Biculturalism on Attitudes toward Diversity (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAX</td>
<td>0.1719</td>
<td>0.0882</td>
<td>-0.0426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL= lower limit, UL= upper limit, CI= Confidence Interval. Bootstrap sample size 1,000.

Table 5. Bootstrap Results for the Conditional Effects (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BII</th>
<th>Conditional effects</th>
<th>Se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>LLCI 95%</th>
<th>ULCI 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1093</td>
<td>-1.8807</td>
<td>0.2402</td>
<td>-7.8306</td>
<td>-2.356</td>
<td>-1.4054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4381</td>
<td>-1.3285</td>
<td>0.2105</td>
<td>-6.3107</td>
<td>-1.7451</td>
<td>-0.9118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.767</td>
<td>-0.7762</td>
<td>0.3814</td>
<td>-2.035</td>
<td>-1.5311</td>
<td>-0.0213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL= lower limit, UL= upper limit. Bootstrap sample size 1,000.
Table 6. Inter-correlations and Descriptive Statistics (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- ATD</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- BICULT</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- BII</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- SE</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- EBR</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Extrav</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Consc</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Agre</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- EmotioS</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- OptoEx</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- EAX</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Age</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- SEX</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Yrs.EXP</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 129. Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities are given in italics on the diagonals.

*a* Sex was coded 1 if female and 0 if male.

* *p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001. Two-tailed tests.*
Table 7. Summary table of results for Study 1 & Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement of the Hypothesis</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Biculturalism is positively related to emotional ambivalence.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>The relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence will be moderated by the biculturals’ level of (BII). The positive relationship between biculturalism and emotional ambivalence will be stronger with low level of BII than with high levels of BII.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>BII is negatively related to emotional ambivalence.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Biculturalism is positively related to attitude toward diversity (ATD).</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Emotional ambivalence mediates the joint effect of biculturalism and BII on attitudes towards diversity.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural competence</td>
<td>The ability to be a socially competent person in the second culture without losing the same competence in the culture of origin.</td>
<td>LaFromboise et al., 1993, p.408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural schema</td>
<td>A socially constructed cognitive system that represents one’s knowledge about the values, attitudes, beliefs, and behavioral assumptions of a culture as well as the relations among these attributes.</td>
<td>Brannen and Thomas 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural meaning systems</td>
<td>Are interpretative frames that affect individuals affect, cognition, and behavior.</td>
<td>Benet Martinez et al 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward diversity</td>
<td>The degree to which one tends to accept minorities, primarily women and non-whites, in the work-place.</td>
<td>Montei, Adams &amp; Eggers, 1996, p. 295)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal diverse orientation</td>
<td>An attitude of awareness and acceptance of both the similarities and differences among people.</td>
<td>Miville et al., 1999, p.291).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of complexity toward workplace diversity</td>
<td>An individual’s view of diversity is differentiated among five different dimensions of diversity reactions: emotional, behavioral, judgment, personal consequences, and organizational outcomes.</td>
<td>Hostager &amp; De Meuse, 2002, p.192.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocultural empathy</td>
<td>A stable but trainable trait defined as ‘empathy directed towards people from racial and ethnic cultural groups different from one’s own group.</td>
<td>Brouwer &amp; Boros, 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural individuals</td>
<td>Are those who have been exposed to and internalized two distinct cultures where both cultures are alive inside them; Hong, Morris.</td>
<td>(Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, &amp; Morris, 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>Changes that an individual experiences as a result of being in contact with other cultures and as a result of participating in the process of acculturation that one’s cultural or ethnic group is undergoing.</td>
<td>Graves (1967, p. 337)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>The ability to regulate knowledge, processes, cognitive, and affective</td>
<td>Thomas, Elron, Stahl, Ekelund, Raylin, Cerdin, &amp; Lazarova, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative complexity</td>
<td>The degree to which a person accepts the reasonableness of different cultural perspectives on how to live, both at the micro interpersonal level and at the more macro organizational-societal levels.</td>
<td>Tadmor &amp; Tetlock, 2006, p.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for cognitive closure</td>
<td>The individual desire to find an answer on a given topic in order to avoid the uncomfortable experience.</td>
<td>Kruglanski, 1990b, p.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional ambivalence</td>
<td>Simultaneous experience of two colliding emotions that are directed toward the same state of affairs where these conflicting emotions are supposed to be fighting for predominance.</td>
<td>Kristjansson, 2010, p.292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional vacillation</td>
<td>Frequent changes in one’s emotions, a case that is attributed to problems with the individual character or the emotional make up.</td>
<td>Kristjansoon, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta- emotion</td>
<td>Emotions that people have about their own emotions.</td>
<td>Jager &amp; Bartsch, 2006, p.179.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duality expertise</td>
<td>Level of expertise with managing simultaneous activation of the two selves.</td>
<td>Kramer et al. 2009, p.662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity conflict</td>
<td>The incompatibility between two identities whereas refers.</td>
<td>Huynh et al., 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity compartmentalization</td>
<td>The isolation of identities into different domains.</td>
<td>Huynh et al., 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-cultural identity conflict”</td>
<td>Perceived intrapersonal conflict between the dominant and the ethnic cultures.</td>
<td>Ward (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity synthesis</td>
<td>Consistent and coherent self-understanding.</td>
<td>Schwartz, 2006, p.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabular Row 1</td>
<td>Tabular Row 2</td>
<td>Tabular Row 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological adjustment</td>
<td>Psychological and emotional well-being.</td>
<td>Ward &amp; Kennedy, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge systems</td>
<td>The behaviors, attributes, and information of particular social categories.</td>
<td>Cheng et al., 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame switching</td>
<td>The shifts between two interpretive cultural frameworks in response to cues from the environment.</td>
<td>LaFromboise et al., 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity</td>
<td>That part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his (or her) knowledge of his (or her) membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership.</td>
<td>Tajfel, 1974, p.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-construal</td>
<td>The knowledge about oneself and that includes social roles, personality attributes, past experience, and future goals.</td>
<td>Fiske &amp; Taylor, 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional reactivity or adaptability</td>
<td>Being able to better manage emotions.</td>
<td>Chao, Chen, Roisman, &amp; Hong, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2.1: Four types of Acculturation Strategies

Source: From Berry and Kim (1986)

Figure 3.2 - Theoretical Model
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Fig 5.2 CFA for the hypothesized model (Study 1)
Fig 5.3 Structure equation model for study 1 (model 1)
Fig 5.4 Structure equation model for study 1 (model 2)
Fig 5.5 CFA for attitudes toward diversity (study 2)
Fig 5.6 CFA for the hypothesized model (Study 2)
Fig 5.7 Interaction effects (Study 2)
Fig 5.8 SEM for Study 2
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